ED 014 519 UD 004 224

GROWING UP POOR.
BY- CHILMAN, CATHERINE S.
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON, D.C. (DHEW)
REPORT NUMBER WA-PUB-13 PUB DATE MAY 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.84 119P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, LOWER CLASS, BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, *MIDDLE CLASS, *CHILD REARING, *FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS, SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT, CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT, *RESEARCH, FAMILY RELATIONSHIP, MENTAL HEALTH, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SOCIAL DIFFERENCES, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, MIDDLE CLASS NORM,

PRIMARILY AN OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH ON CHILD-REARING AND FAMILY LIFE PATTERNS, THIS BOOK FOCUSES ON THE LIFE OF THE VERY POOR AND COMPARES THEIR LIFE PATTERNS AND PRACTICES WITH THOSE OF MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES. THE TWO SETS OF PATTERNS ARE ANALYZED UNDER FIVE HEADINGS--MENTAL HEALTH, EDUCATION, "MORAL" CHARACTER, SOCIAL ACCEPTABILITY, AND FAMILY STABILITY. IMPLICATIONS FOR TREATMENT STRATEGIES FOR THE VERY POOR AND FOR SOME BASIC AND ACTION RESEARCH FOLLOW THIS DISCUSSION. ONE OF THE BOOK'S MAJOR CONCLUSIONS IS THAT RESEARCH ON THE VERY POOR IS FRAGMENTARY AND THAT RESEARCHERS OFTEN NEGLECT INDIVIDUAL VARIABILITIES WITHIN GROUP TENDENCIES. THEN, BECAUSE MIDDLE-CLASS NORMS ARE APPLIED TO THE POOR, THESE PERSONS APPEAR TO BE PARTICULARLY MALADJUSTED, WHEN IN FACT MIDDLE CLASS PATTERNS OF ADJUSTMENT MAY BE UNSUITABLE FOR LIFE IN POVERTY CONDITIONS. IT IS ALSO SUGGESTED THAT ALTHOUGH LOWER-CLASS FAMILIES ARE LESS STABLE THAN MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES, THEY STILL IN FACT ARE STABLE. INTERVENTION STRATEGIES WHICH ARE RECOMMENDED INCLUDE PLANS FOR EXPANDED SERVICES IN THE SLUM SCHOOL, ENRICHMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR PARENTS, SPECIAL SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE FAMILY, AND ADEQUATE INCOME SUPPORT. AVAILABLE FROM SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, U.S. GOVT. PRINT. OFF., WASHINGTON, D.C., 20402, PRICE $0.45. (LB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE ERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS TATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION OSITION OR POLICY.

UD 004224

04224

B 14

ED014519

Growing Up Poor

Growing Up Poor

An over-view and analysis of child-rearing and family life patterns associated with poverty

Implications for the • mental health • educational achievement • social behavior • family stability of very poor parents and their children

Suggestions for action programs

Guide-lines to further research

CATHERINE S. CHILMAN, Ph. D.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Welfare Administration
Division of Research
Washington, D.C. 20201

One reason for the time lag in the application of research findings is the difficulty of keeping abreast of the numerous studies of importance to the field of social welfare. To alleviate this problem, the staff of the Research Division of the Welfare Administration from time to time culls the salient findings reported by many investigators in a subject area and prepares a summary digest. This publication is based upon a review of the most recent and pertinent studies relating to the child-rearing and family life patterns of the very poor.

ELLEN WINSTON
U.S. Commissioner of Welfare

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 Price 45 cents

FOREWORD

This book is addressed to a professional audience of practitioners and researchers who are concerned about the serious and multiple disadvantages of the poorest families in our society. Social workers, educators, and medical personnel—as well as investigators in the social and behavioral sciences—will find information and ideas useful to them in their work as they seek to understand and serve the parents and children of poverty.

For the first time, research-based knowledge of the child-rearing and family life patterns more characteristic of the very poor has been brought together by Dr. Catherine Chilman and related to research-based knowledge of child-rearing patterns that contribute to positive outcomes in mental health, educational achievement, socially acceptable behavior, and family stability.

Reflecting the concern of the Welfare Administration for practical and continuous interaction between research and program activities, this publication presents various action suggestions derived from the research summation and analysis. A final chapter is devoted to the identification of some major research issues for the future, both basic and applied.

A number of leaders in the social welfare field as well as staff members of the Division of Research have made important contributions to this publication. Special acknowledgment is made of the extensive assistance given by Elizabeth Herzog of the Children's Bureau of the Welfare Administration and Lee Rainwater, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at Washington University, St. Louis.

The identification, evaluation, and translation of relevant research, in many discrete forms, have been skillfully brought together by the writer. The result should have important uses in social work education, staff training, and program planning.

Genevieve W. Carter
Director, Division of Research
Welfare Administration

Contents

I. *INTRODUCTION* 1

II. *SUBCULTURES OF POVERTY: SOME LIMITATIONS OF RESEARCH* 5

III. *PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS* 15

IV. *EMOTIONAL HEALTH* 27

V. *EDUCATION* 41

VI. *SOCIAL ACCEPTABILITY* 57

VII. *CONSCIENCE FORMATION* 61

VIII. *FAMILY LIFE STYLES* 67

IX. *IMPLICATIONS FOR SOME SPECIFIC INTERVENTION STRATEGIES* 75

X. *SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH* 101

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES 109

Tables

I. *FAMILIES WITH OWN CHILDREN; 1960* (By Various Categories; Proportion of Each Classified as Poor) 18

II. Child-rearing patterns reported to be more characteristic of families of children who are emotionally healthy compared with relevant patterns reported to be more characteristic of very poor families 28

III. Child-rearing patterns reported to be more characteristic of families of children who are educationally achieving compared with relevant patterns reported to be more characteristic of very poor families ------------------ 43

IV. Behavioral characteristics reported to be more characteristic of socially acceptable school children compared to the relevant child-rearing patterns that are reportedly more characteristic of very poor families. ------ 59

V. Child-rearing patterns reported to be characteristic of families of children who are of "good character" compared with relevant patterns reported to be characteristic of very poor families -------------------------------- 63

VI. Attitudes and behavior revealed by research to be more prevalent among low-income men and women compared with attitudes and behaviors reported to be associated with "good" marital adjustment --------------------- 72

Figures

1. "Age at which half the total growth that will occur by ages 18-20 has taken place"* -------------------- 47

2. "Mean CGT standard scores, standard deviations and range of scores of 18,782 AAF white enlisted men by civilian occupation"** -------------------------- 49

*Chart from Bloom, Benjamin S. *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1964.

**Table by Harrell and Harrell from Tyler, Leona E. *The Psychology of Human Differences*. Appleton-Century, Crofts. New York, 1965. 3rd ed.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This is primarily an overview and analysis of large bodies of research having to do with child-rearing and family life patterns in the United States today. While the major focus is on the patterns of the very poor, an allied and comparative focus is on child-rearing and family life patterns that are revealed by studies to be associated with optimal child development and family stability. The two sets of patterns are reviewed, compared, and analyzed under five major headings: mental health, educational achievement, social acceptability, "moral" character, and family stability. The review and analysis are followed by a discussion of implications for treatment strategies for the very poor and of implications for both basic and applied research.

As an introduction to this review and analysis, some basic concepts are considered, and some limitations of the research on which the paper is based are pointed out.

The term "very poor," as used here, refers to those families who live at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder, as distinguished from those who are a number of rungs up this ladder—the generally self-sufficient and at least moderately successful working-class members. The very poor include individuals who have extremely limited employment skills—unskilled, casual laborers; the chronically unemployed or severely underemployed; and persons who are apt to have less than an eighth grade education and who, for the most part, come from families in which lack of education, lack of steady employment, and lack of adequate income have tended to be the rule for several generations. These are the families that are often referred to as the "hard-core poor"—and this hard core seems to be central to the "cycle of poverty."[1]

Poverty Patterns and the Family

The terms "cycle of poverty" (poverty that extends from generation to generation) and the "culture of poverty"[2] (the distinguishing folkways of the very poor) are at present well on their way to becoming cliches. This is unfortunate, because both are important concepts. They are important chiefly because they provide significant insights and constitute a clear demand for further action and further study.

Further action and study are needed in relation to the ways that many of the very poor bring up their children and in the ways that family members tend to relate to each other. It is so well recognized that the family is one of the most basic units of society (if not *the* most basic) that the point needs no belaboring here. It is also generally recognized that lifelong patterns of behavior, values, goals, and attitudes of children are strongly associated with the characteristics of their parents, especially as these are expressed in child-rearing and family life styles. Although later experiences outside the home also have important influences on the developing child, the availability of these experiences to him and the ways in which he uses them (such as the educational system) are strongly affected by what he has learned in his home. Thus, patterns of child-rearing and family life styles are crucial to the individual and to society.

Since one of the crucial issues of the day is to help many more people become fully participating members in our generally prosperous society, and since both individual and societal changes are required to achieve this goal, it is imperative to understand more about the ways in which the very poor tend to raise their children and conduct their family life. (Societal changes are beyond the scope of this paper except as general concepts. See Chapter III.)

General recognition has been given to the fact that many "children of poverty" are poorly prepared for school. "Cultural deprivation"[3] has also recently won a place in the cliche system, along with the "culture" and the "cycle" of poverty. "Cultural deprivation" has been given a crisis priority because of its implications for "educational deprivation." In the rush to get every small citizen educated for skilled, technical employment, there is a recent tendency in some quarters to overlook earlier—and just as important—concerns: emotional health, socialization for group membership, conscience formation, and family stability. Since children of very poor families are apt to contribute, in time, a disproportionate share of their numbers to the mentally ill,[4] the delinquent,[5] the broken family,[6] and the socially rejected,[7] as well as to the undereducated and unemployed,[8] it seems important to consider the development of the whole child, as he is reared in the so-called culture of poverty. If he is to escape effectively from the many-faceted frustrations that beset the very poor, he must escape as a whole person, not just as an efficient and employed cog in the economic complex.

The overview includes a consideration of cultural patterns associated with parent-parent relationships, as well as with relationships between parent and child, because the family is viewed here as a dynamic, interacting network of roles and relationships that affect both the developing child and the participating adults. Although in seeking solutions to social problems such as poverty, the tendency is to focus on the child as being the most amenable to change, it is a humanitarian and pragmatic necessity to consider, as well, the needs, rights, and growth potential of adults—humanitarian, because the concern of a democracy is with the optimum welfare of every citizen; pragmatic, because the capacity for growth of adults is perhaps far greater than has been generally believed, because adults have a tremendously significant impact on children, and because adult dependency is costly to society.

Purposes and Objectives

One of the purposes of this overview is to stimulate deeper understanding of some of the human problems associated with poverty. An allied purpose is to stimulate further creative thinking about what kinds of action programs might be developed to help poor people leave the conditions of deprivation, defeat, and despair which currently tend to keep them at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder.

A third objective is to suggest areas in which further basic research is needed. To this end, some of the current gaps in our knowledge are pointed out in reference to the child-rearing and family life cultural patterns of very poor families. Some suggestions are also made regarding needed action research.

CHAPTER TWO

Subcultures of Poverty: Some Limitations of Research

Is There a "Culture of Poverty"?

The "culture of poverty" has become a popular term, in professional circles, at least, since it was used by Oscar Lewis in the 1961 National Conference on Social Welfare.[2] Culture, as defined by him, consists of a design for living which is passed down from generation to generation. He points out, furthermore, that the culture of poverty has its positive, as well as its negative, aspects. On the negative side are the social and psychological deprivations and handicaps which Riessman,[3] among others, has described so vividly. On the positive, and less publicized, side are the strengths: "the structure, rationale, and defense mechanisms without which the poor could hardly carry on." Or, as Handel and Rainwater put it, "the fortitude with which they face the many frustrations which threaten to engulf them."[7]

Interest in the "culture of the poor," as applied to child-rearing practices, goes back at least to 1946, when the studies of Davis and Havighurst on class differences in child-rearing methods were published.[9] Since that time, studies in this area have proliferated, and it is now generaly recognized that lower-class and middle-class families tend to raise their children and conduct their family relationships in quite different styles. It is also generally recognized that the outcomes of these different styles tend to be reflected in different behaviors, values, attitudes, achievement levels, and personality patterns for individuals who have been brought up in families at the various social class levels.

Although there is general agreement that class culture "makes a difference," there is, as yet, lack of agreement on what all these differences are. There is also lack of agreement as to whether the term "culture of poverty" is sufficiently accurate. There is a difficulty in the over-generalization of this term. Although further research may reveal that Oscar Lewis[2] is right in his contention that certain characteristic child-rearing and family relationship patterns are found in the "cultures of the poor" in all Western societies, it seems premature to embrace this contention too ardently. It should be borne in mind that studies in this area are relatively few, samples have been small and not necessarily representative of the larger population, methods of study tend to be observational and intuitive for the most part and subject to the biases and perceptions of the interviewers. Greater scientific precision is being developed in this area of research, as well as in other areas, but the time has not yet come when great confidence can be placed in the results.

For instance, it would probably be more accurate to talk about the *sub*cultures of poverty. The word "sub" is used because most of our poor would seem to subscribe to the "middle-class American way" as, at least, a cultural ideal which most would accept, in theory and fantasy. Hyman Rodman,[10] for instance, talks about the "lower-class value stretch." By this he means that the poor, caught in a situation of economic deprivation and social disorganization, stretch and adapt the values of the middle-class culture to the realities of their own lives. Meyers and Roberts[4] are among those who discuss the necessity for the pragmatic, materialistic, present-oriented attitude of the poor, pointing out that when getting and holding a job and buying food are paramount necessities of the moment, many middle-class values, such as a consideration of the subtleties of human relationships, are necessarily pushed to the background.

Subcultures of the Poor: Some Limitations of Related Research

The term subculture*s* seems more appropriate than subculture. This is because research on other aspects of varying cultures and common observation in working with low-income people from various backgrounds would strongly suggest that within the subcultures of poverty, there is a wide variety of differing child-rearing and family relationship patterns associated with race, religion, region of the country, national background, rural-urban locale, exact social class level, age, and sex. Some recent studies of low-income cultures have examined questions of racial patterns within the same social class;[11,12,13] some have examined patterns in relation to both masculine and feminine roles;[13,14,15] some have looked at the subcultures of the adolescent poor;[16,17,18] and a very few studies have carefully differentiated their population as being either working-class (upper-lower or middle-lower) or lower-lower-class.[19] On this point Elizabeth Herzog comments:

"Reference to the poor does not, of course, mean that lower level of a three-way breakdown into upper, middle, and lower socieconomic groups.

We have had abundant evidence that this lower segment of the traditional three-way break is itself divided into a number of layers. We have evidence, too, that the life-ways of the very lowest differ from others in the same band more than the so-called upper-lower differs from the lower-middle."[20]

She goes on to say that the "ill-defined group referred to as 'the poor' does not include the working class. Since many studies of lower-class culture do not make adequate discrimination between this class and layers below it, assumptions about the 'culture of poverty' may, in at least some cases, be wrong ones." Moreover, evidence is emerging from studies of the recipients of Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) and others of the dependent poor that there are important differences between the very poor who manage to maintain themselves without public assistance and those who do not have the resources to achieve even a minimum level of economic independence.[21,22] For example, negative public attitudes towards mothers who are dependent on AFDC tend to transfer to the mothers and their children, with an associated sense of failure, strong self-disparagement and hopelessness.

In ascribing a certain socioeconomic level to an individual, occupation, education, income, and place of residence are the factors most often used. Moreover, a family is usually described as belonging to a certain social class because the *head* of the family has a certain education, occupation, etc. Seldom is attention paid to these factors as they apply to the wife and mother (unless the father is out of the home), and even more infrequently is the grandparent generation considered. Yet it seems as if the class characteristics of the wife and grandparents are definitely important, particularly in reference to the ways in which these characteristics may affect child-rearing and family life practices.

For example, a family might well be assigned to middle-class status because both parents are college graduates, but these same parents might have come from homes in which their parents were unskilled laborers with less than an eighth grade education. Especially if these grandparents retained close relationships with their children and grandchildren, child-rearing practices would tend not to be solidly middle-class. Even if such a close multi-generation tie did not exist, the newly-arrived middle-class parents would tend to interweave some of their own early patterns into newly acquired ones as they raised their children. Moreover, a family would probably be assigned to middle-class status if the father were a college graduate and employed in a middle-class occupation, even though his wife might be a high school graduate or less. The odds are that the mother would not use strictly middle-class child-rearing practices and that her approach to child-rearing would have more impact on the children than would the father's. Since American society is still somewhat fluid in reference to upward (and downward) social mobility, since men and women do not always marry within their own social class, there are variations within the social class related to these, as well as other, factors. An extended and more sophisticated view of family social-class membership is indicated by considerations of this kind, as well as by considerations of layers within a large social class.

The question of within-class layers applies also to studies of culture characteristics of racial groups. When Negro-white differences are examined in the subculture of the poor, for instance, there is a tendency to make insufficient discrimination between working-class and lower-lower-class patterns. Thus, cultural patterns are often described as being "typically Negro," when, in actuality, they may be more typically lower-lower-class than racial in nature. More careful studies, taking the variations in socioeconomic level into detailed consideration, are beginning to shed more light in this area.

Another area in which a careful delineation of subcultures may be necessary is in that of rural, as contrasted to urban, subcultures of poverty. And, in considering the matter of rurality, differences would probably be found in rural-farm compared to rural non-farm cultures,[23] in rural areas close enough to urban ones to feel their effect strongly, and in rural areas isolated "back in the hills and hollows." Rural conditions of isolation and lack of opportunity for escape may tend to "freeze" a subculture with especial rigidity. Then, too, isolated rural areas, with their provincialism, probably carry a stronger regional and historic flavor in their "subculture of poverty"—if, indeed, rural areas have as many subcultures as urban ones do. From the little that is known, it appears that the presence or absence of social stratification and subcultures in rural areas would be strongly affected by the region itself: its history, geography, economic situation, and so on.

It appears that few, if any, studies have been done on the culture of the rural poor, and yet this group makes up about 15 percent of our current population, with 50 percent of the rural population having incomes below the "poverty line." An exception to the above statement may be found in a recently published study[24] of a lower-class, white religious group in an isolated southern mountain community. In a number of ways, the cultural characteristics of the group were different from those commonly reported from studies of the poor.

Limitations Imposed by Basic Questions in the Study Design

Another limitation to research findings on the subculture of poverty relates to biases and limitations imposed on research in general, since findings are irrevocably and inherently tied to the basic hypotheses and questions on which a study (or studies) are based. That is, the researcher will miss possibly important facts unless he designs his research with pertinent questions in mind—or unless he observes certain facts in the course of his study and redesigns his research so that he can investigate them systematically. Specifically, the child-rearing patterns and family life styles of the very poor may contain significant elements—such as defense mechanisms of humor, drama, and fantasy—elements that will not be found unless relevant questions about them are built into the research design. Therefore, only part of the total picture on the subject of low-income cultures—as on many other subjects—is available, partly because not all of the possibly relevant questions have been asked. Moreover, it seems as if research has focused chiefly on the weaknesses of the poor rather than on their strengths.

Some Limitations of Questionnaires

Not only are there difficulties associated with the basic questions built into research design, there are also difficulties associated with obtaining reliable and valid data from testing instruments selected to answer these basic questions. While it is inappropriate to present a full discussion of reliability and validity here, it is appropriate to mention that special difficulties arise in the use of questionnaires with low-income groups. Among the difficulties are the following: a low level of literacy frequently obtains; words and concepts often have different culturally affected meanings; there is often a strong tendency in low-income subjects to respond in the affirmative in order to ingratiate themselves with the researcher; the testing situation may be far from ideal, with lack of privacy; etc. (For a full discussion of these and related points, the reader is referred to Radin and Glasser.[25])

Statistical Significance Vs. Pragmatic Significance

Another limitation inherent in some of the findings reported in this paper also involves difficulty frequently associated with research in general. Many of the findings regarding parental practices of low-income families are derived from comparing their practices and attitudes on various behavioral dimensions—discipline, for instance—to the practices and attitudes of middle-class families. While a behavior or attitude may be found to be significantly (in the statistical sense) more characteristic of one group than another, that does not necessarily mean that this behavior or attitude is *characteristic of most of the group*. To take a hypothetical example, 10 percent of a group of middle-class parents may report that they use physical force in disciplining their children, while 30 percent of a lower-class group may report this practice. Statistical analysis may show that significantly more lower-class research with pertinent questions in mind—or unless he observes certain facts in the course of his study and redesigns his research so that he can investigate them systematically. Specifically, the child-rearing patterns and family life styles of the very poor may contain significant elements—such as defense mechanisms of humor, drama, and fantasy—elements that will not be found unless relevant questions about them are built into the research design. Therefore, only part of the total picture on the subject of low-income cultures—as on many other subjects—is available, partly because not all of the possibly relevant questions have been asked. Moreover, it seems as if research has focused chiefly on the weaknesses of the poor rather than on their strengths.

Some Limitations of Questionnaires

Not only are there difficulties associated with the basic questions built into research design, there are also difficulties associated with obtaining reliable and valid data from testing instruments selected to answer these basic questions. While it is inappropriate to present a full discussion of reliability and validity here, it is appropriate to mention that special difficulties arise in the use of questionnaires with low-income groups. Among the difficulties are the following: a low level of literacy frequently obtains; words and concepts often have different culturally affected meanings; there is often a strong tendency in low-income subjects to respond in the affirmative in order to ingratiate themselves with the researcher; the testing situation may be far from ideal, with lack of privacy; etc. (For a full discussion of these and related points, the reader is referred to Radin and Glasser.[25])

Statistical Significance Vs. Pragmatic Significance

Another limitation inherent in some of the findings reported in this paper also involves difficulty frequently associated with research in general. Many of the findings regarding parental practices of low-income families are derived from comparing their practices and attitudes on various behavioral dimensions—discipline, for instance—to the practices and attitudes of middle-class families. While a behavior or attitude may be found to be significantly (in the statistical sense) more characteristic of one group than another, that does not necessarily mean that this behavior or attitude is *characteristic of most of the group.* To take a hypothetical example, 10 percent of a group of middle-class parents may report that they use physical force in disciplining their children, while 30 percent of a lower-class group may report this practice. Statistical analysis may show that significantly more lower-class parents than middle-class ones use physical forms of discipline. However, 30 percent is clearly a minority of the group reporting. In the search for interesting and statistically significant research findings, it is a temptation to report differences as if they had greater practical significance than they do. To what extent findings reported in this overview are clouded by the above kind of technical problem is not clearly known in all instances by the author, because such a microscopic analysis of all the studies upon which this report is based is beyond the scope of a paper of this kind.

Group Findings Vs. Individual Diagnosis

Another word of warning. Generalizing from findings about groups to assumptions about an individual is unwarranted. For instance, in discussing the subcultures of the poor, Elizabeth Herzog[20] warns against taking a "cookie cutter" approach to an understanding of *individuals* in the various social classes. Not only is an individual a cluster of identities related to his many reference groups; he also has his own unique psychological style and genetic potential in making use of and expressing his identities. Although this comment on individual differences is old hat to those in the service professions, a "new hat" enthusiasm—such as the impact of cultural differences—can lead to an over-enthusiastic ritual of hat-changing. Many of the old hats, along with new ones, are needed for an effective approach to the complexities of human behavior.

Hazards of Predictions About Individuals From Research Evidence Concerning Groups

Not only are there conceptual factors that militate against the generalization of findings about groups to conclusions or predictions about individuals, there are also methodological ones. From the methodological point of view, prediction of individual behavior from research evidence relating to groups is a very sticky problem. A full exploration of this problem far exceeds the limitations of this paper. A few general, nontechnical comments are in order, however. (Statistical concepts discussed here and elsewhere are presented in nontechnical terms for the benefit of those readers who have not had specialized training in this field.)

In the first place, research evidence pertaining to groups tends to be of more value to those engaged in the development of general policies and over-all programs than to those engaged in working with individuals. This is so, mostly because the bulk of research pertains to *group* trends and tendencies and to likenesses and differences between *groups*.

Transferring measures of groups to measures of individuals is methodologically hazardous for many reasons. One of the important reasons is that measurements of groups usually involve the use of averages or of proportions (such as, in the case of proportions, one-third of a group, three-fourths of a group, etc.). Averages and proportions fail to take into account the variability of individuals—for example, an average group score might be 50, but some individuals within the group might have a score of five and some of 90 or more.

Some statistical measures used in research readily yield a measurement of this variability—commonly called the variance or standard deviation. When such measures are available, the meaning of evidence as it may apply to individuals becomes clearer. For technical reasons, contingency analysis (Chi square) is the statistical measure very commonly used in many studies of attitudes, life styles, values, and behavioral practices, partly because many group averages may be compared simultaneously. This statistical method fails to provide a ready measure of variability, and thus this method (to a greater extent than some others) provides fewer clues as to what the research evidence may mean for specific group members.

A hypothetical example will help to clarify the above point. A number of studies may show that a larger proportion of various kinds of middle-class children than of many categories of lower-class ones get grades of B or higher in school. (This is the kind of result that may have been derived from the use of a research design which lends itself to contingency analysis, i.e., Chi square.) This evidence reveals only general information as to the tendency of these two social class groups to obtain different average school grades. More specific information is available if the study design and statistical analysis make it possible also to report (for instance) that groups of middle-class children obtain an average of 2.9 in school grades (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1), while groups of lower-class children obtain an average of 1.7. The variability (variance) of the middle-class groups is found to be .4 grade points, while the variability of the lower-class groups is found to be 1.3 grade points. One of the helpful pieces of information yielded by this reportage of grade point averages and the different amounts of variability in the two groups is that, in this hypothetical example, lower-class children are shown by the measure to tend to be less like each other in the grades they receive than are middle-class ones. Since the variability for the lower-class group is found to be larger, it is (probably) more hazardous to predict a lower-class individual's grade-point score from a knowledge of scores for his group than would (probably) be the case in predictions for middle-class children.

Although these figures and findings are hypothetical ones, there are actual clues that the variability of a number of measures of groups of the very poor may be greater than is the variability for middle-class groups. (See also Chapter V, pp. 47–50.)

To sum it up, research design which permits a ready computation and presentation of measures of variability also permits more precise interpretation of results, especially in their application to individuals. As already commented, much of the research concerning child-rearing and family life patterns tends not to use measurement instruments which readily yield a measure of variability.

Multiple Causation of Child Behaviors

Related to the above cautionary points as to the infinite variety of individual behaviors within a cultural (or other) group and the methodological hazards of predictions about individuals, there is a third point. Little evidence is available that a certain set of parental attitudes and practices has a simple, direct impact on the behavior of children. For instance, Bettye Caldwell and Julius Richmond comment along these lines:

> "In order for the social class concept to be a meaningful variable in the study of parent-child relationships, it is essential to trace the full sequence of social class parent behavior-child response, and, on the whole, this full cycle has received scant attention. . . . Basically there have been two literatures concerned with social class differences—one dealing with parents, one dealing with children—and seldom have the twain met. Empirical studies of class differences in parent behavior have dealt primarily with child-rearing practices, parental attitudes, and parental values; those concerned with children have dealt mainly with intelligence and learning or with delinquency. But these generally represent different samples, not a sample of parents and *their* children."[26]

It is also clear that child behavior is molded by factors outside the immediate family. These factors include the nature of the immediate and larger community, the informal social groups within it, and the impact of such formalized social institutions as the church and health, education, and welfare services. For example, the conditions, reference groups, and community agencies associated with urban slum life might well have a strong causal influence on a child's delinquent behavior or learning blocks—perhaps to just as great a degree as the child-rearing practices of his parents. More studies of within-family sibling variations are indicated for this, as well as for other, reasons. Moreover, further studies are indicated of very poor children and families within a variety of environmental settings.

Summary

The chief points that have been made so far are as follows:

(a) The "culture of poverty" can be more accurately described as a *subculture*.

(b) The subculture of poverty may be more clearly defined as subculture*s*.

(c) Information as to these subcultures is fragmentary; it rests largely on observations, interviews, and questionnaires that have unknown biases; it rests on small samples of the population, and these samples often are not clearly enough defined in terms of their exact socioeconomic level, region, race, age, sex, nationality, and religion.

(d) Behavioral characteristics of individuals stem from factors other than their culture and subculture; moreover, an individual can belong to a number of subcultures, all of which have an impact on his values, goals, attitudes, and overall personality functioning.

(e) Research findings relate to groups and describe average group tendencies, insofar as these are known; within any group studied, there is individual variability; these conclusions and recommendations apply to thinking about and planning for a number of people; specific differential diagnosis and planning are still required for work with individuals.

(f) Research findings are generally limited to the original hypotheses and questions on which the study was based; also, findings can be misinterpreted as applying to most or all of a group, when this may not be true.

(g) Research findings are also limited, in that studies are generally lacking which clearly delineate the direct impact of parental child-rearing patterns on child behavior, especially with a concomitant consideration of social class variables.

(h) There is a tendency to confuse statistical significance with practical significance or with *majority* group trends when research evidence is reported and interpreted; this can lead to highly erroneous conclusions.

Comparison of the Patterns of the Very Poor to Those of the "Ideal" Parental Patterns

In this overview of research findings, a second major dimension consists of an associated overview of research findings related to child-rearing and family life styles which studies have revealed to be associated with "successful" child-rearing and marital stability. The related research also has its limitations (see Chapter X for a brief discussion), although much more is known in these fields than in that of the subcultures of the very poor.

CHAPTER THREE

Preliminary Comments on Implications of Research Findings

Along with warnings regarding the limitations of the research evidence on which this paper is based should go qualifying statements on the program implications of this research. A general discussion of the pros and cons of these implications is given here, with detailed comments at appropriate points in later chapters. This approach is adopted because certain issues are basic and have general application. A discussion of them here avoids repetition later.

In reference to the five fields examined—emotional health, educational achievement, social acceptance, moral behavior, and family stability—the evidence strongly suggests (as is to be detailed in Chapters IV–VIII) that the very poor, in effect, are more likely than more advantaged socioeconomic groups to raise their children in ways that are inadequate for successful functioning in our society. The simple, straightforward implication of such evidence is that program efforts should be directed toward helping the very poor change their child-rearing and family life patterns in a variety of ways so that the members of these families will have better preparation for full membership in our predominantly middle-class socioeconomic system.

However, there are a number of arguments for and against such a holistic and assertive approach. Some of the chief pros and cons to this approach are given below. As these are given, it is important to bear in mind that there are limitations to the research evidence on which this discussion is based and that this evidence applies (within the limits of its generalizability) to group tendencies rather than to individuals.

The Middle-Class Bias

In a sense, it is hardly surprising that lower-lower-class child-rearing attitudes and methods, on the average, are less apt than middle-class ones to lead to favorable emotional adjustment, academic achievement, social acceptability, "good moral character," and family stability. For adequate functioning in our society is generally equated with adequate adaptation to middle-class norms. Prevailing concepts of "emotional adjustment," for example, are middle-class concepts, involving such principles as impulse-control, responsibility, and goal commitment.

Moreover, middle-class child-rearing patterns, in comparison to those of the very poor, tend to be automatically weighted to yield favorable results for the middle-class child's educational achievement, since schools are largely middle-class in their values, teaching methods, materials, goals, and standards of behavior. It is quite natural that the child who is raised in a middle-class family would be more likely to achieve in such a setting than would a child raised in a different experiential network.

The same principle applies to social acceptability. Again, it is built into the system that children from middle-class homes would "naturally" be socialized by their parents—in most cases—to fit into the social life of the average school, religious organization, and community. After all, the major social systems are institutionalized expressions of middle-class social norms.

In similar fashion, the average middle-class child is more likely to be "moral" than the average lower-class child, since criteria of morality are derived from the middle-class value system. For instance, the ability to withstand the temptation to cheat, or steal, or lie, has been used in various studies as the criterion of morality. Independent work (not cheating), respect for private property, and honesty are more apt to be values of the middle class than of the lower-lower class. One reason for this is that these values, pragmatically speaking, can be more easily maintained when a certain margin of security and affluence exists.

Also, criteria of "marital success" and family stability tend to be strongly middle-class, with stress placed on equality, continuity, and psychological satisfactions in interpersonal relationships. It does not necessarily follow that the very poor generally hold such values as crucial to their satisfactions in a male-female relationship. Their higher rates of divorce, separation, desertion, and self-perceived marital unhappiness, however, strongly suggest that the very poor, more than other groups, are dissatisfied with their marriages.

The Poverty Situation: Some Highlights

The tendency of the very poor to fail to move into the mainstream of society is the failure of society, to a large extent. The subcultures in which these children and parents live have developed out of the poverty situation itself. A quick look at who the very poor are throws light on some of the failures of the socioeconomic situation in which they live. The emphasis here is on poor families with their own children, rather than other members of poverty groups, such as the very old. An examination of Table I reveals a number of important points. Figures in this table[27] have been derived from the 1960 U.S. Census, in which the poor were defined as those families which had less than $3,000 in money income in 1959. The highly disadvantaged position of families with a female head is strikingly revealed by these figures in that they show that over half of the white families in such a category were classified as poor, and four-fifths of the nonwhite families were so classified. That poverty is more characteristic of rural than of urban areas is shown by the fact that, in all categories, at least 10 percent more of the rural families were classified as poor than of the urban families. The discrepancy between rural and urban families with a male head is particularly high. Further regional differences are revealed by the fact that poverty rates are considerably higher in the South than in other parts of the country, and especially so in the rural South.

In commenting on these figures, Helen Witmer, who developed this particular presentation, writes:[27]

> "As would be expected, a piling up of disadvantages increases the likelihood of poverty—so much so, indeed, that in the most disadvantaged group in 1960, 90 percent of the families were poor as contrasted with 5 percent of the most advantaged group. In detail, the situation was as follows. When to a family's disadvantage of belonging to a nonwhite race was added the disadvantage of having the chief wage earner a woman, the likelihood of poverty was further increased by rural residence (89 percent of such families were poor) and even more (raising the proportion to 90 percent) by rural residence in the South.
>
> "When advantages rather than disadvantages pile up the opposite is true. Fourteen percent of all white families with own children were poor in 1960. When these families had a male head the proportion of poor dropped to 11 percent. When, in addition, such families lived in an urban area, only 6 percent were poor. And when the urban area was one that was outside the South, the proportion of poor families dropped to 5 percent."

As of 1962, about 60 percent of the heads of poor families had an eighth grade education or less, compared to about 30 percent of families above the poverty line. The relationship between low educational level and lack of occupational opportunity is too well known for further comment here.

Further environmental disadvantages afflict the very poor. Their lack of adequate housing and the multiple disadvantages of poverty neighborhoods are generally recognized. The tendency for schools to be of poor quality in low-income areas has also been so well documented of late that further development of this point seems unnecessary here. It is appropriate to point out, however, that, in effect, poor schools are a

Table I.— Families With Own Children, 1960— by Various Categories; Proportion of Each Classified as Poor*

[In thousands]

				Total	Poor
All Families With Own Children				25,661	4,278 (17%)
White families				23,263	3,154 (14%)
	Male head			21,869	2,364 (11%)
		Urban		15,043	953 (6%)
			South	3,571	370 (10%)
			Non-South	11,472	583 (5%)
		Rural		6,826	1,411 (21%)
			South	2,509	741 (30%)
			Non-South	4,317	670 (16%)
	Female head			1,394	790 (57%)
		Urban		1,085	580 (53%)
			South	278	163 (59%)
			Non-South	807	417 (52%)
		Rural		309	210 (68%)
			South	134	100 (75%)
			Non-South	175	110 (63%)
Nonwhite families				2,398	1,124 (47%)
	Male head			1,901	723 (38%)
		Urban		1,388	374 (27%)
			South	589	240 (41%)
			Non-South	799	134 (17%)
		Rural		513	349 (68%)
			South	433	319 (74%)
			Non-South	80	30 (38%)
	Female head			497	401 (81%)
		Urban		413	326 (79%)
			South	182	156 (86%)
			Non-South	231	170 (74%)
		Rural		84	75 (89%)
			South	73	66 (90%)
			Non-South	11	9 (82%)

*U.S. Census: 1960, PC(1)D. U.S. volume, Table 225; State volume, Table 140. "Poor" is defined as less than $3,000 in money income in 1959.

particularly serious disadvantage to the poor. More than any other group they need an excellent educational system.

Growing attention is being paid to the fact that the very poor are less likely than other groups to be effectively reached by health and welfare services which have presumably been established for their benefit. They are also likely to be relatively unaffected by the social insurances, since they are less likely than other groups to have been employed for long enough periods of time in occupations covered by social security. Moreover, the higher rates of out-of-wedlock births for low-income, nonwhite groups mean, among other things, that these mothers are less likely to have formal arrangements for the support of themselves and their children than is more generally true for widows and divorcees.

Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) is the major program of public assistance to families that lack a male head. According to Kahn and Perkins, "AFDC assistance standards are so low that most families receiving aid still live in gross poverty. Of all public assistance recipients, AFDC families receive the least adequate public assistance payments. Year after year, of all groups aided under the Federal-State programs, families with children fall furthest behind in progress in American standards of living, despite some increases in the total and average amounts of assistance provided."[28] These authors go on to say that in 1961 the total income of AFDC families averaged $1,680 a year, a little more than half of the $3,000 figure used as the poverty demarcation line in the President's estimate. Nearly half of all AFDC families have some unmet need under their State's own standards for public assistance. Thirty-four of the 50 States do not meet the full amount of determined need for all AFDC families. Moreover, only 18 of the States provide AFDC payments to families of the unemployed. In many States, no public assistance in cash is available for intact, very poor families. Added to this is the fact that a very large number of families who are eligible for AFDC are not receiving public assistance—in many cases, partly because they fail to apply for such assistance.

Again, according to Kahn and Perkins, "Despite the inadequacies of public assistance, those who receive public aid, including financial assistance and social services, are more fortunate than some others in similar economic circumstances who receive no financial aid or other services. Data on income of families with children indicate that substantial numbers of other children are growing up under equally deprived or poorer conditions without aid from the AFDC program. Considerably more help will be needed through public assistance or other means if all the children of the very poor are to have the opportunity to avoid repeating their parents' experience and to achieve a healthy, self-supporting adulthood."

Critics of AFDC programs frequently claim that many of the recipients "could easily find work if they really wanted to." While it is true that employment may be a desirable future goal for a number of mothers who receive aid under this program, such employment is hardly practical for the majority of them, unless a number of supporting community services are provided. Some of the major reasons for the above statement include the following facts (highly condensed here):

1. Most of the mothers who receive public assistance under the AFDC program have children under the age of 12; about two-thirds have children under age 6. The average number of children in the families is three.[8] If these mothers are to enter employment without producing damaging effects on their children,[31] adequate substitute child-care arrangements must be made available. Very few, or none, of such mothers would be able to earn enough to support their families and pay for adequate child care arrangements.[29] Probably no community in the United States is currently equipped financially or administratively to provide the kind of child care needed for all low-income, working mothers of small children.[30]

2. Most of these mothers (about three-fourths) failed to finish high school;[8] most have little or no vocational training. The only work which they might be able to find would probably be as factory operatives, unskilled, seasonal, agricultural laborers, or service workers. The wages in these occupations are generally very low—especially for women and especially for nonwhite women. According to Department of Labor figures,[29] even if these women were able to find and hold full-time jobs in the above occupational categories, the odds are strongly against their earning more than $3,000 a year. If they worked part-time (more generally recommended for mothers whose children are still at home),[31] their average earnings would probably be less than $1,000 a year. Thus, the majority of mothers who currently receive assistance from AFDC funds would not be able to lift their families above the poverty level, even if they obtained full-time employment. They most certainly would not be able to pay for adequate substitute child care.

If these mothers did enter emlpoyment and their children were not cared for adequately during the mother's working hours, their growing-up years would probably be especially disadvantaged and this, in turn, could well lead to an even larger and more deprived poverty population in the generation to come.[31]

3. Various studies of mothers who receive AFDC reveal that a high proportion of them suffer from physical disabilities, serious emotional problems, and severe learning deficits.[8] If they were to obtain and hold employment successfully, many would first need extensive and intensive remedial medical, psychological, and educational, social, and vocational services.

4. Since most of these women are the sole parents in their families, it would be especially difficult for them and their children if they also worked outside their homes. Here, again, added community services might well be needed—such as visiting homemakers—if these mothers were to secure and hold employment without further damage to themselves and their children.

To sum it up: a network of many community services is needed if very poor mothers are to work outside their own homes, especially if they are the heads of households. Employment for such mothers is not likely to provide an escape from poverty for themselves or their children unless many changes are made in community services, employment opportunities, and the wage structure.

The above evidence as to the depriving environment of the very poor is strongly condemning of an affluent society. It also presents a multitude of reasons to support the contention that the subcultural patterns of the lower-lower classes tend to constitute an adaptation to the environment of poverty.

Racial Prejudice and Poverty

The extremely deprived situation of many nonwhites is strikingly impressive. While prejudice and its many associated deprivations are an important aspect of the subcultures of poverty for the nonwhites, this paper does not attempt to distinguish between nonwhite and white groups in reference to child-rearing and family life patterns of the very poor. The reason for this is that research is generally lacking in this area. (See Chapter II.)

However, data are available showing the extremely disadvantaged position of nonwhite groups in the labor market. Their problem has become particularly acute with the increasing disappearance of unskilled jobs. The lower-lower-class Negro, for example, particularly the Negro male, suffers extreme constriction in employment opportunities. Unemployment and underemployment of nonwhite youths and adults, especially males, is a national problem of critical proportions. The repercussions of this problem are felt acutely in many areas, including that of the family.

In matters of education, housing, social interaction, recreation, and community services, nonwhite children and adults, especially those who are in lower-lower socioeconomic groups, are likely to meet a complexity of limits to free participation in the social system. The interaction of this complex of constrictions necessarily affects the child-rearing and family life patterns in a variety of intricate ways.

Despite legislative and administrative progress in recent years, prejudice continues to impose, albeit to a lessened degree, a web of frustrations and constrictions on nonwhite groups, especially very poor nonwhite groups.

The Interaction of Subcultures and the Poverty Situation

Although the poverty situation and class and racial prejudice, especially those existing over generations, are probably basically responsible for the subcultures of the very poor, changes in the situation alone are not enough. The values, goals, attitudes, and behavioral styles of many lower-lower-class individuals appear to interact with the poverty situation in such a way as to make it difficult for them to escape from poverty, even when the opportunities for this escape are opened. This interaction may be conceptualized as the hub of the cycle of poverty. It is apparent that an improved opportunity system must be developed, as well as changes in subcultures, so that those of the very poor so affected can develop the motivations, abilities, and goals that are consistent with upward mobility.

Some would object to the foregoing statement on various grounds. In the first place, a quite valid objection is that human behavior is determined by a number of factors other than culture. There is a wide range of individual differences within a cultural group, as pointed out in Chapter II.

Moreover, some would raise questions as to whether changes in the subcultures of poverty toward a more middle-class life style might not be part of the essentially flattening process already too prevalent in society—the standardization of life into a monotonous conformity. Along with these pressures for conformity, repression, and self-control may go the guilty, competitive anxieties so prevalent in the middle class. Arguments can be made both for and against the prices and rewards of this conformity. Perhaps full participation in a highly mechanized society demands such a pattern, although it could be argued that new ways can and must be pioneered in the cultivation of creative leisure for a large segment of the population and a reformulation of the "productive, economically rewarding work ethos" as *the* American way. Further discussion of this point will be left to others, since a full exploration is far beyond the scope of this paper.

Since it looks as if middle-class parents are more apt than lower-lower-class ones to bring up "successful" children, partly because our society is predominantly middle-class, it could be argued that it is mostly the provinciality and intolerance of this middle-class attitude that condemn the lower-lower-class to a tendency toward failure. It could be further argued that greater understanding and flexible acceptance of the very poor and their ways would tend to reduce their higher rates of poor emotional health, school failure, social rejection, "immorality," and family instability.

While understanding and acceptance of individual and class differences are in order, a laissez-faire attitude may not be. While the individual, as a *person,* is certainly to be respected and understood, it does not necesarily follow that all his behaviors are to be condoned.

Laissez-faire acceptance of the values, attitudes, and behaviors of the very poor would seem to carry with it an acceptance of a class system that is, and inevitably would be, stratified.

The Rewards Associated With the Middle-Class Way

It is not as if one class system were as pragmatically effective, in an urban, industrial society, as another. With all its faults, the middle-class way, compared to that more typical of the very poor, seems to be more in harmony with present-day economic realities. The middle-class approach has played importantly into the building of this system and has been built by it. For example, middle-class values include norms such as commitment to long-term goals, achievement, rationality, abstract learning, active coping with an environment that can be conquered, and self-restraint: all these, among other traits, have had an important part in the development of an industrial, complex, automated society. The resultant society, with its demands on the individual to step up his theoretical and behavioral adherence to such values, tends to reinforce the middle-class way as the way of success.

This way assuredly has its negative aspects. Middle-class anxiety, conformity, and materialism are widely recognized as modern social ailments. The poverty ailments of hunger, illness, failure, and rejection have been re-recognized of late. The acute problems of the poor are clearly more severe than the chronic harassments of the middle class. At least, it looks that way to most observers.

Thus, it could be argued that many of the very poor need to change their customs if they are to move out of poverty. It is possible that some of them may think it hardly worth the price. And some, of course, may believe that, even if they pay the price, nothing will come of their investment.

Many governmental and voluntary efforts are directed toward opening up the "opportunity system" so that such an investment will be worth the price. But an improved system also would seem to require "improved" participants: that is, many lower-lower-class individuals will not be able to use new opportunities unless they change many of their modes of behavior.

Is There a Right to Deviancy?

Some would argue that such a behavioral change is the right of the individual to accept or reject. His right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" is considered inviolable. But, of course, this right is not inviolable. The individual's rights and those of society often conflict. For example, when the individual pursues life, liberty, and happiness outside the law, society puts limits on him.

The question of individual rights versus the rights of the group has always been a thorny issue. In some ways, at least, it is getting thornier, as our society moves ever more rapidly from a simple, rural system to a far more complex urban one, where the problems of the deviant may become the problem of a larger, more intricate structure, involving far more people. When lower-lower-class families lived in isolated hills and hollows, the impulsive, openly aggressive, day-to-day, fatalistic style of many of them was apt to hurt no one but themselves, and, in many instances, it was probably a more helpful than hurtful mode of adaptation to rural isolation. In crowded cities, more self-restraint and planful behavior are called for—for the welfare of the poor themselves as well as for everyone else.

The apparently higher rates of child abuse, child neglect, delinquency, crime, vandalism, and general social deviancy more prevalent in the lower-lower class cannot be accepted with equanimity in a society which values the rights of the individual to protection from and for himself. These behaviors especially cannot be accepted in an urban society where, for instance, one man's undisposed garbage becomes the neighborhood's rat problem, or where one impulsive, hostile, aggressive youth can become a menace to his family, neighborhood, community, and—with the aid of a gun—the nation. And where a neglected, abused child can grow into such a youth. (Of course, such behaviors pose a danger to the individual and to society in whatever social class they occur; these behaviors simply are—or appear to be—most prevalent in very poor groups.)

Subcultural patterns of the very poor also have a tendency, along with the poverty situation itself, to produce financial costs to society's more advantaged members. Our concern for the welfare of the individual has created such social systems as public assistance, public housing, public health services, and public education. These systems are financed from the public purse. May it, therefore, follow that the beneficiaries of these services also have certain responsibilities in reference to adapting to relevant social norms and in reference to participating in programs aimed at helping them toward self-support and better management of their resources?

The "Right" To Rise From Poverty

Of course, the issue of "being poor" is not only the concern of those who support the poor. More importantly, it is the concern of the poor themselves. It is bitter to be on the outside looking in. Especially when the "in" is so lush, and the more glittering aspects of this lushness come teasing, in sound and shape, over the airways into the squalid but "TV'd" homes of the poor.

It could hardly be said that the very poor are satisfied with their poverty situation. As already indicated on page 6, the very poor ascribe, at least in aspirations, to the middle-class way. Like most other parents, they want their children to "have a good education"; they want better jobs for themselves and even better ones for their sons and daughters. They, too, aspire to homes of their own and the material comforts of our society. Good physical and mental health is also a goal. So is "keeping out of trouble" with the law. Moreover, lower-lower-class families surely do not relish their status as "failures" in a success-oriented social system. Furthermore, like other human beings, they, too, want the security and warmth of a stable, satisfying marriage and family life. They want these things because they are human beings and fellow-citizens. They often have little knowledge as to how such aspirations may be fulfilled. But the opportunity structure and their own subcultures have tended to operate toward frustration rather than fulfillment for those who have been caught in the cycle of poverty.

Thus, both for the benefit of a number of the poor themselves and for the rest of society, it would apear that, among other things, methods should be found within the democratic framework to help many lower-lower-class parents raise their children in ways that, in the light of available evidence, would seem to be predictive of a greater likelihood of success and fulfillment in today's society. Whether or not these ways can be found and what their effect may be is still, to a large extent, unexplored territory. More detailed attention to this question will be given in Chapter IX and X.

The chief points that have been made in the foregoing pages may be summarized as follows:

1. Evidence to be presented in the next five chapters strongly suggests that the very poor, more than other groups, tend to employ child-rearing and family life patterns that are maladaptive to our society in these areas: mental health, educational achievement, social acceptability, "moral" behavior, and family stability.

2. It is more or less natural that such appears to be the case, because middle-class standards are applied to very poor, as well as to other, socioeconomic groups.

3. Although it could be argued that such a middle-class bias tends to condemn the very poor to this position, a counter-argument may be advanced that our affluent, highly technical, urbanized society has been created by, and continues to exist through, such middle-class cultural norms as goal-commitment, achievement orientation, and an instrumentalist approach. While such a culture demands a price of individuals who subscribe to it, the rewards associated with this approach would seem to be considerably greater than the penalties. Sharing in our rather general prosperity would be preferred by most to not sharing in it.

4. The very poor fail to receive their share of benefits from the socioeconomic system, mostly because of the system itself. The poverty environment has created the subcultures of poverty. While it is recognized that the environment is particularly apt to create poverty for nonwhite groups, specific discussion of the effects of prejudice on the subcultures of poor families cannot be adequately explored in this paper because there is a dearth of research which examines relevant ethnic differences. (See Chapter II.)

5. The subcultural adaptation to poverty would seem to interact with the poverty situation to perpetuate lower-lower-class status. For the welfare of many of the very poor, as well as for the welfare of the rest of society, it seems to be necessary to help a large group re-adapt its life styles to more effective patterns. Concurrently, it is imperative to implement massive changes in the poverty situation itself.

6. These twin programs would seem to be particularly essential in society as it is today. Outstanding reasons for this statement are the following: (a) a highly urbanized, technical, densely populated environment requires a higher level of conformity to social norms, partly for the protection of all who live within such a society; the rights of the individual versus the rights of society become an increasingly complex and crucial question under these conditions; and (b) an affluent, highly technical, urban society creates a network of expectations which lead to increased dissatisfaction for those who are excluded from their realization; under these conditions, the gulf between the haves and have-nots becomes more agonizing and potentially wider.

If the trend toward a large, continuing poverty population in this country is to be reversed, then far-reaching changes must occur for many subcultural groups. Some of the changes that may be needed in these subcultural patterns, and the patterns themselves, will be reviewed and analyzed in the next section of this report.

CHAPTER FOUR

Emotional Health

This chapter is concerned with an overview and analysis of research evidence as it relates to the child-rearing patterns of the very poor and their implications for emotional health.

The more recent emphasis in research in the area of child-rearing has been on the quality of family relationships, the patterns of affection and authority, parental attitudes toward the meaning of behavior, and the expectations of parents for their children. At an earlier point in research activities, the focus had been more on specific child-rearing practices. A greater sophistication has led to moving away from detailed descriptions of methods and techniques and into a more fundamental consideration of attitudes. This is related to the findings that parents' attitudes and feelings toward their children are more important in affecting their behavior than are their exact practices.

Table II presents research findings related to the area of *emotional health.* In the left column of this table are listed the parental patterns and behaviors that a number of studies reveal to be positively conducive to the "good adjustment" or positive emotional health of children. On the right side are listed those associated parental patterns that are found to be more characteristic of low-income parents than of middle-class ones. Numbers at the top of each column allude to footnote references. Cautions referred to in the first sections of this paper should be borne in mind, including the point that, although research reveals an association between certain parental patterns and child behaviors (such as "good adjustment" in this case), this does not necessarily mean that there is a simple direct cause-effect relationship between these patterns and behavioral outcomes.

The accumulated evidence presented in Table II would strongly suggest that lower-lower-class parental patterns, compared to middle-

Table II.—Child-rearing patterns reported to be more characteristic of families of children who are emotionally healthy compared with relevant patterns reported to be more characteristic of very poor families

CONDUCIVE (Refs. 58-69)	**LOW-INCOME** (Refs. 2-5, 19, 20, 32-57)
1. Respect for child as individual whose behavior is caused by a multiple of factors. Acceptance of own role in events that occur.	1. Misbehavior regarded as such in terms of concrete pragmatic outcomes; reasons for behavior not considered. Projection of blame on others.
2. Commitment to slow development of child from infancy to maturity; stresses and pressures of each stage accepted by parent because of perceived worth of ultimate goal of raising "happy," successful son or daughter.	2. Lack of goal commitment and of belief in long-range success; a main object for parent & child is to "keep out of trouble"; orientation toward fatalism, impulse gratification, and sense of alienation.
3. Relative sense of competence in handling child's behavior.	3. Sense of impotence in handling children's behavior, as well as in other areas.
4. Discipline chiefly verbal, mild, reasonable, consistent, based on needs of child & family & of society; more emphasis on rewarding good behavior than on punishing bad behavior.	4. Discipline harsh, inconsistent, physical, makes use of ridicule; based on whether child's behavior does or does not annoy parent.
5. Open, free, verbal communication between parent & child; control largely verbal.	5. Limited verbal communication; control largely physical.
6. Democratic rather than autocratic or laissez faire methods of rearing, with both parents in equalitarian but not necessarily interchangeable roles. Companionship between parents & children.	6. Authoritarian rearing methods; mother chief child-care agent; father, when in home, mainly a punitive figure. Little support and acceptance of child as an individual.
7. Parents view selves as generally competent adults, and are generally satisfied with themselves and their situation.	7. Low parental self-esteem, sense of defeat.

Table II.—Continued

CONDUCIVE (Refs. 58-69)	LOW-INCOME (Refs. 2-5, 19, 20, 32-57)
8. Intimate, expressive, warm relationship between parent & child, allowing for gradually increasing independence. Sense of continuing responsibility.	8. Large families; more impulsive, narcissistic parent behavior. Orientation to "excitement." Abrupt, early yielding of independence.
9. Presence of father in home and lack of severe marital conflict.	9. Father out of home (under certain circumstances).
10. Free verbal communication about sex, acceptance of child's sex needs, channeling of sex drive through "healthy" psychological defenses, acceptance of slow growth toward impulse control & sex satisfaction in marriage; sex education by both father and mother.	10. Repressive, punitive attitude about sex, sex questioning, & experimentation. Sex viewed as exploitative relationship.
11. Acceptance of child's drive for aggression but channeling it into socially approved outlets.	11. Alternating encouragement & restriction of aggression, primarily related to consequences of aggression for parents.
12. In favor of new experiences; flexible.	12. Distrust of new experiences. Constricted life, rigidity.
13. Happiness of parental marriage.	13. High rates of marital conflict and family breakdown.

class ones, tend to be antithetical to a child's positive emotional health. The first reaction to this evidence might be a strong urge to launch programs designed to change these child-rearing patterns. Aside from the fact that there is little evidence that such programs would be successful, there are other considerations at stake.

A Mental Health "Value-Stretch"

In the first place, as indicated in Chapter III, the lower-lower-class society, with its many social and economic deprivations and dangers, may be the patient to a greater extent than the people who live in it. Perhaps it is a sign of a "mental health value-stretch" that people who live in a world where exploitation, overcrowding, poor public sanitation, lack of stable employment, inadequate relief, and commercialized vice are the rule take a pragmatic, fatalistic, alienated, physically aggressive, impulsive, "trouble-avoiding," distrustful, and despairing view of life. A more goal-committed, rationalistic, involved, and verbal approach might lead to higher rates of mental breakdown than now occur. There is ample documentation that lower-lower-class life in the slum is a dangerous, threatening, and frustrating affair. On the other hand, these lower-lower-class life styles and attitudes seem to predispose the individual to self-defeat in the event that opportunities are opened to him for escape. This interaction between the ills of the environment and the subculture of the poor is an important aspect of the cycle of poverty. (See also page 22.)

In a sense, it is little wonder that child-rearing and parental behavior patterns more characteristic of the very poor appear to be so different from those which research shows to be associated with "good adjustment" or positive mental health. Both of these concepts are primarily middle-class ones, partly because they are associated with effective coping with our predominantly middle-class society. For example, the following is representative of current formulations of positive mental health.

> ". . . A mature person is one who, having met many problems has developed a range of competencies which enable him to meet those of adult life. From his experiences he has acquired some capacity for independent action, for making his own decisions, and for controlling his emotions. He subordinates the satisfaction of some impulses in order to accomplish more worthy purposes. Because he tends to be task-oriented rather than self-oriented, he can work with and feel with others in spite of their inadequacies and imperfections. He meets problems, solves them, and moves on without prolonged emotional disturbance. Thus an ability to bounce back and to repair oneself, added to the capacity to remain stable and wholesome in the face of the complexities of living marks a well-adjusted and mature person. The goal of development is then the orderly, persistent, and responsible behavior out of which come efficiency and power. . . ."[70]

It is apparent that criteria of this kind are closely tied to the middle-class value system and the middle-class situation. Thus, the "well-adjusted" child is most apt to be the middle-class child. Moreover, "adjustment" involves ready adaptation to reality—and social realities in American society generally include middle-class norms and opportunities. Adjustment to these realities is easier for those who have been raised with them and for those who have reason to expect that these *are* realities for them. (Emphasis is placed here on middle-class society and middle-class concepts. While it is recognized that our society also has an upper-class echelon, reference is not made to this group, primarily because very little research is available regarding its child-rearing and family life patterns.)

Another and associated word of warning: Most of the research on "good adjustment" as related to parental practices has been done with middle-class groups.[26] If specific studies were carried out in lower-lower-class settings, with the criteria of "adjustment" developed around successful survival in such an environment, quite different results might be obtained.

The whole issue of "good adjustment" is a sticky one, indeed. While it is recognized that adaptation to our predominantly technological, materialistic, competitive, urban society is not necessarily "good adjustment" or positive mental health in an abstract sense, the ongoing social system is not an abstraction for those who are living in it. And the predominant ongoing social system in the United States is the one described above. The rewards for adapting to this system are apt to be greater than the penalities for failing to do so. (See also Chapter III.) Moreover, the rates of mental illness of the very poor are much higher than for other groups.[4] Despite this last point, it is re-emphasized that more mental illness—and other problems of the very poor—might accrue if they were led to change their patterns and aspirations and found that middle-class society still had no place for them.

Psychological Depression—A Poverty Syndrome?

The child-rearing patterns, as revealed in Table II, strongly suggest a tentative general diagnosis, conceptualized here as a "poverty syndrome." It is hypothesized that *emotional depression* may be the prevalent life style of many lower-lower-class members and that this depression (if such it is) has its origins in overwhelming anxiety associated with the almost constant powerful frustrations and threats which surround the slum-dweller from infancy to old age. While both research and theory point to the positive contribution of mild frustration and associated mild anxiety to achievement and to ego-strength, constant and overpowering frustrations make achievement an untenable goal and seriously weaken the ego—or self-esteem.

Much has been made of the deleterious effects of middle-class anxiety deriving from guilt associated with repression and pressures for conformity and achievement. While this kind of anxiety exacts a toll from middle-class members, it embodies concepts of hopeful goal-striving.

To the anxiously overactive, striving, middle-class individual, many members of the lower-lower class may look enviably relaxed and "happy." The impulsivity, timelessness, and fatalism more characteristic of the disadvantaged as a group, may be experienced by the more advantaged as a disturbing threat to their own carefully and uncomfortably maintained psychological controls. Thus, partly as a protection for their own self-structure, middle-class members are likely to react with punitive and moralistic attitudes toward the "lack of ambition" in the poor.

This (perhaps) lack of ambition may be born of a depressed reaction to failures and frustrations and would seem to represent a hopeless acceptance of deprivation that is a far heavier psychological burden, for many, than that of anxious, competitive, middle-class striving. Attitudes of alienation and anomie may be symptoms, in part, of this depressed reaction.

With generally less ego strength (lower self-esteem), the very poor individual is apt to have greater need than his middle-class counterpart for security-giving psychological defenses. But defenses such as sublimation, rationalization, identification with the larger community and its leaders, compensation, idealization, and substitution of generally accepted gratifications are not so readily available to him in his impoverished, constricted environment and with his own lack of economic and intellectual resources. As Sewell and Haller [32] comment, for instance, the lower-class adolescent tends to use defense mechanisms in handling aggressive drives and failure fears which require little previous experience, involve maximum distortion, and create social difficulties, whereas middle-class children are more apt to use defense mechanisms which require many skills, involve a minimum of distortion, and are socially acceptable.

The Struggle for Valid Identity

Another way of conceptualizing the psychological problems of the very poor is to suggest that they, far more than working class or middle-class persons, would appear likely to have little reason to see themselves as having a valid identity.[42] If they do indeed accept, at least in fantasy, the middle-class American way, then the gap between their own situation and that of the affluent ideal is a huge gap, indeed. The gap between fantasied identity and actual identity would seem to be so great as to make a farce of either the ideal or the self. Since the individual cannot maintain his psychological equilibrium if he perceives himself as being unreal, the lower-lower-class person may be forced to regard the dominant social structure as being basically unreal for him. He may tend to give up an instrumentalist, actively coping orientation and to retreat into an anxiety-produced depression which he seeks to alleviate through meagre and inappropriate defenses. He may seek immediate gratification through impulsive expressiveness, self-dramatizing fantasies, or escape with the aid of narcotics and alcohol.

Special Adjustment Problems of the Lower-Lower-Class Male

Since the pressures on the lower-lower-class male for unobtainable occupational success are greater than on the female, it is hypothesized that depressive reactions, confusion over identity, and recourse to the various mechanisms for self-expressive escape would probably occur in a higher proportion of men and to a more pervasive degree. The higher rates among males (especially in the lower-lower class) of mental illness, alcoholism, drug addiction, crime, and delinquency are, perhaps, associated, at least in part, with factors such as these.

McKinley,[5] in an analysis of his own and other research, emphasizes that the lower-class boy, far more than the lower-class girl, and far more than young people of more privileged socioeconomic groups, is likely to be treated with great hostility and active aggression by his father. McKinley theorizes, and marshals somewhat oblique evidence to support his point, that the very poor father, frustrated by his powerless position in the larger world, takes out his resultant rage on one of the few possible targets—the family. Since severity toward sons is more sanctioned than severity toward daughters, and since the father feels an especially keen rivalry with his son, the boy in the very poor family tends to become a scapegoat for his father's failures. If McKinley is right, the generation-to-generation aspect of this kind of experience seems clear—in that the boy in such an environment is, in effect, taught a self-destructive and family-destructive form of behavior.

While research evidence is generally lacking as to possible differences in the child-rearing patterns of disadvantaged whites and and nonwhites, it is possible that the foregoing suggested hypotheses would apply more stringently to nonwhite groups, since the daily frustrations which they tend to experience are generally higher.

As frequently remarked, the nonwhite individual has a particular source of frustration in American society in that there is no way that he can move into full membership in the majority group through his own efforts and achievement. No matter what educational-occupational level he achieves, no matter what behavior patterns he adopts, he remains nonwhite. So long as our society maintains a "success image" as being Caucasian, the nonwhite person must experience, in one way or another, a sense of deviancy. Changes in the ‘success image" are beginning to occur. Further progress along these lines should play some part in reducing the damaging impact of the "color line."

Psychological Immaturity—The Poverty Subculture

It has been suggested above that many of the very poor would seem likely to experience a basic sense of anxiety-induced depression, associated with the multiple and severe frustrations of the poverty situation. The subcultural patterns of this group, as revealed by a number of studies, also suggest that their life style, more than that of working-class and middle class groups, might be termed (within the middle-class frame of reference) as immature in a number of respects, such as their greater tendency toward impulsivity, lack of goal commitment, magical thinking, physical learning and behavioral styles, low frustration tolerance, concrete attitudes, and so on. These (so-called) immature characteristics, occurring in adolescents and adults, might seem to be related to the regression that occurs when an individual succumbs to hopelessness. Regression is likely to be the wrong term for many of the poor, since the life ingredients for developing toward psychological maturity* have been largely denied them in the first place. For instance, growth toward psychological maturity is associated, to a large extent, with such life experiences as are presented in the left column of Table II. Very poor parents who grew up in chronic poverty would be less likely than other adults to have such experiences in their family of origin. This is one aspect of the cycle of generation to generation poverty.

A common middle-class cliche about the very poor is that they are "like children and should be treated this way." Psychological immaturity in adolescents and adults, however, is considerably more complicated than the simple developmental immaturity of children, and the treatment for this immaturity is more complex than simple paternalism. Treating youths and adults like children is an affront to their age status and is not calculated to help them grow into age-appropriate behavior. Recognizing unmet psychological needs which hamper an adult's behavioral functioning can be quite different from treating an adult like a child.

A slightly different, but basically analagous, way of conceptualizing the factors in the poverty situation and poverty subculture that play into the higher tendency for the poor to suffer from defective mental health is spelled out by Beiser,[71] a member of the team which has been conducting the Cornell Program on Social Psychiatry. Based on the findings of the Cornell team and evidence from other studies (many of which have been used as evidence for this report), Beiser proposes that the very poor in disorganized communities tend to lack the developmental experiences that Erik Erickson postulates as being fundamental to the well-integrated personality. Their experiences, for example, tend to produce basic mistrust rather than trust, shame and doubt instead of autonomy, doubt rather than initiative, a sense of failure rather than one of mastery, isolation rather than intimacy, and despair rather than ego integrity.

---

*The term "psychological maturity" is used here largely as a frame of reference for those who conceptualize human behavior largely in psychological terms. From the viewpoint of the sociologist or anthropologist, "maladaptive to the dominant culture" would probably provide a more acceptable term. As pointed out on page 30, the prevailing concept of psychological maturity in this country is largely a middle-class concept.

Possible Roles of Constitutional and Health Factors

Another question that must be raised in this analysis of variables that may contribute to the life styles and conditions of the very poor is that of the part that may be played by physical-constitutional factors, both genetic and acquired. From the genetic standpoint, it is highly possible that the poverty environment draws to itself a disproportionate number of persons whose intellectual and physical functioning is less than adequate, or is particularly vulnerable to stress, primarily—or partly—because of genetic variables. Of course, inadequate physical and intellectual functioning can be further depressed because of the deprivations associated with poverty. Along with those that have been sketchily mentioned above are also variables such as poor medical care and inadequate nutrition. To an unknown extent, the apathy, lack of goal commitment, and resignation more typical of the very poor may be partly a product of an impaired level of physical health and functioning. Physical factors and their possible effects on the life styles of the very poor also constitute another large body of knowledge beyond the limits of this presentation. Their probable importance is simply mentioned here lest the impression be given that the subcultures of the very poor are totally associated with social, psychological, and economic variables.

Specific discussion is called for in reference to points 6 and 9 on Table II (p. 28): "Democratic child-rearing methods" and "Authoritarian child-rearing methods," and "Father out of the home (under special circumstances)" and "Father present in home."

Democratic Child Rearing: Some Attributes

In reference to point 6, there has been considerable popular and, to a lesser extent, professional confusion over what is meant by democratic child-rearing methods. Permissiveness and even neglect have frequently been equated with democratic or equalitarian approaches to child-rearing. The democratic approach, found to be conducive to the child's mental health, means an approach that takes into account the *rights* and *responsibilities* of *all* members of the family—including parents. It also means an approach that allows for discussion and debate but eventuates in rules to which various members of the family are expected to adhere. It cherishes a disciplined, rather than an anarchic, individualism. Parents perceive themselves as senior members of the family, with final decision-making power after the evidence is in and after extenuating circumstances have been considered. Parents have equal powers in decision-making, with children allowed increasing self-directive and family-directive rights as they grow older and show their readiness by their own behavior.

It is clear that such an approach requires considerable capacity for self-control, goal commitment, verbal ability, observation powers, and comprehension of abstractions on the part of parents. It would seem to require a large margin of self- and financial security and a relatively benign environment. It also requires a sure sense of personal identity on the part of parents, a wealth of "constructive" psychological defenses, and an optimistic rather than depressed life style. In other words, a stable working-class or middle-class society and parental life experience would seem to be more conducive to a democratic child-rearing style than would the life experiences and environment of the very poor.

Fatherless Homes: Pros and Cons

In reference to point 9, evidence is conflicting as to whether or not fatherless homes are conducive to "poor adjustment." Although a number of studies indicate that this may be so, especially for boys, there is also conflicting evidence on this point. A body of research reveals [36,37,48,49,50] that fatherless homes are likely to produce boys who have problems in masculine identification and (according to some evidence) who develop a defensive facade of pseudo toughness. A careful study of McCord, McCord, and Thurber,[72] however, indicates that a number of qualifications need to be made about the broken home theory. In an examination of data for boys from fatherless homes, compared to those from nonbroken homes on the same low socioeconomic level, these investigators found that adverse effects on boys in terms of high sex anxiety and criminality were more prevalent for those who came from intact homes with high rates of marital conflict than for those who came from broken homes. Also, for the most part, parents whose marriages were not intact were more apt to display deviant behavior themselves. Such behavior, rather than the marital break, may have played importantly into the higher levels of aggressive behavior generally found for boys from broken homes. Moreover, signs of feminine identification were found mostly for boys in which the mother in the fatherless home was cold and rejecting or in which the fathers had left when the boys were between the ages of 6-12.

Another noteworthy finding was that whether or not boys from broken homes showed behavior disturbance depended to a considerable extent on what their family situation was following this break (foster home placement, presence of stepfather, etc.). The authors suggest, furthermore, that studies which reveal an equation between broken homes and behavior problems may produce such findings partly because groups from broken and intact homes are not matched for social class, and broken homes are far more prevalent among the very poor.

Another study raises question as to the adverse effects of broken homes on the behavior of children. In a study of 174 children between the ages of 5-15 who were products of broken homes, matched to a group of 174 children from intact homes, Russell[73] found little difference in incidence of behavior problems and educational retardation between the two groups.

Because 25 to 40 percent[74] of urban slum children live in fatherless homes, it is important to define more clearly through further research what the differential effects are on both boys and girls under varying circumstances of mother-only homes. Bell, for example,[74] suggests that since lower-class Negro families tend to be matriarchal and since the one-parent family is accepted in this subculture, adverse effects on children may not actually occur, especially since the father, when he is in the home tends to be harsh, authoritarian —and unemployed. The writer would like to suggest, in refutation, however, that Negro fathers probably behave in this way because of their own negative experiences in growing up in a matriarchal, man-critical home and in their lack of opportunity for education, employment, and home and community involvement. Rather than accept the mother-headed family as a given, it would seem sounder to devise strategies aimed particularly at helping the lower-lower-class male develop his potential as an individual, especially if he is nonwhite, since the situation of nonwhite males is apt to be particularly acute. (See also p. 21 and p. 33.)

McKinley[5] hypothesizes that the lower-lower-class home, which has a tendency to contain a relatively strong mother and a low-status, hostile father, is likely to present intense problems in masculine identification for the boy. In situations of this kind, a son finds it difficult either to admire or to feel close to his father and is apt to turn to his mother for emotional support and emulation. Disturbed by this intimacy and by the threat to his masculinity, he tends to adopt an exaggerated virility and toughness and to form a strong bond with an adolescent, masculine peer group. The masculine peer group often has far more meaning to the very poor boy than to boys from other social strata. The anti-authoritarian and defensive attitudes of such groups probably relate, in part, to defective father-son relationships. The general alienation of these groups from girls (except as objects of sexual exploitation) is probably associated in part with the too close mother-son dyad. Unresolved conflicts of this sort are seen by McKinley as carrying over into later life and further complicating already extant problems in educational, vocational, familial, and personal adjustments.

Simply to say, as Bell does, that the one-parent, matriarchal family tends to be characteristic of subcultures of poverty does not resolve the problem, for boys and girls of any socioeconomic level must make their way in a society which sets up institutionalized exectations of men and women. The adult lower-class male, for example, who is cut off from family membership (through nonmarriage, desertion, separation, or divorce) has far higher rates of alcoholism and mental illness than either lower-class married males or nonmarried males from other socioeconomic levels. This is likely to be associated both with his own problems in individual development and socialization and, partly, with society's hostility toward its deviants, particularly its male adolescent and adult deviants, and especially those from lower-lower-class groups. Community agencies and institutions, for example, generally provide far less adequate services and assistance to the man who is in trouble than they do for the woman. Another difficulty arises, in that, even when services are provided, men, especially lower-class men, are less likely than women to use them.

Another adverse effect of the fatherless family may relate to the fact that so many mothers, in such a situation, are forced to seek employment outside the home. While a number of studies indicate that a child's adjustment does not seem to be negatively affected by maternal employment, in and of itself, it is affected negatively unless continuous, adequate, responsible, substitute child care is provided.[31] Low-income mothers do not have sufficient earnings to provide care of this sort, nor do most communities provide adequate day care facilities.[30] Moreover, there are clues that maternal employment may affect boys differently from girls.[31] Since boys are likely to have psychosocial disturbances if they identify with their mothers, boys from fatherless homes in which the mother is the wage-earner may find it difficult to see the wage-earning role as one that is appropriate for them.

It is appropriate here to remind the reader that hypotheses, conclusions, and recommendations, such as those presented in this chapter, are generalizations applying to further research, tentative predictions, and programming for *groups*. These generalizations become quite different when individuals are being considered. In an attempt to understand and plan for and with a particular family or family member, individual, differential diagnosis and treatment are clearly required. Over-all planning and research strategies directed toward helping a group of people escape from generation-to-generation poverty are necessary for the formulation and implementation of policy and experimental studies. Within a general "intervention framework," individual, specific strategies must be developed. This reminder applies both to the foregoing chapter and to those that follow.

Summary

In summary, the following major points have been made in reference to the child-rearing patterns of the poor and their association with the mental health of this group.

a. The child-rearing patterns more characteristic of the very poor, compared to those parental patterns that studies reveal to be associated with positive emotional health, indicate that lower-lower-class parents tend more than other parents to raise their children in ways that militate against "good adjustment."

b. "Good adjustment" (i.e., mental health) concepts, however, are strongly middle-class in nature. Furthermore, the *situation* of poverty shapes child-rearing patterns that are adaptive to the poverty environment; parental patterns consonant with the middle-class view of good adjustment might well promote poor adjustment to the poverty environment.

c. Environmental modifications, *plus* simultaneous modifications in child-rearing patterns, are indicated to interrupt the cycle of poverty and its associated higher rates of mental illness.

d. It is postulated that the more dramatic, expressive, impulsive, personalistic life style often found in very poor groups may constitute for many a defensive way of coping with overwhelming anxiety related to a pervasive, hopeless depression born of severe frustrations and rejections. Healthier and more socially acceptable psychological defenses, such as sublimation, rationalization, idealization, and compensation, are not so readily available to lower-lower-class groups as to those higher on the socioeconomic scale. Middle-class anxiety, in contrast to that of the lower-lower-class, is viewed here as being essentially optimistic—i.e., it is related to competitive striving for goals which are perceived as being attainable.

e. Total life experiences and poor physical health factors relate in a variety of ways to the higher rates of mental illness for those chronically below the poverty line. Genetic factors may also play a role.

f. Research evidence can be marshalled for and against the hypothesis that the relatively high proportion of fatherless families among the poor has a seriously adverse effect, per se, on the mental health of lower-lower-class children. On balance, it would seem that fatherless homes present a serious detriment to the optimal emotional development of the children in such families.

CHAPTER FIVE

Education

Introduction

The educational potential and progress of lower-lower-class persons have become a matter of increasingly acute public concern. This concern is primarily related, of course, to the close association between educational achievement and employment in a highly technical society. It is unnecessary to detail here the evidence supporting this contention. It is relevant, however, to suggest that it is possible that an overly simplistic conclusion can be made in assuming a one-to-one association between success in educational achievement and occupational adequacy. It is probable that many of the same underlying individual qualities which lead to educational success also lead to stable employment: such qualities as intelligence, motivation, identification with middle-class values, emotional stability, and so on. Moreover, the same socioeconomic environmental factors that are associated with educational adequacy for most of the population would tend to be associated with occupational adequacy, e.g., high quality public schools are more likely to exist in communities which have a flourishing economy acompanied by a low unemployment rate.

As in other aspects of this report, factors such as the above are recognized but do not constitute its focus. Since the present focus is on child-rearing and family life patterns of the very poor and their implications for crucial areas, this chapter presents material chiefly related to this issue. Closely associated issues are also discussed, i.e., some of the arguments and evidence for and against the "cultural deprivation concept," especially in the early years of life. While there is an impressive body of evidence to support the theory that the first few years of life are crucial in the development of intelligence and learning capacity, another body of evidence points to the wide range of individual variability in reference to rates of growth of these characteristics. Highly condensed evidence is presented on both sides of this question, with suggestions as to some research and practice issues. This material is complex and technical. The chief purpose in presenting it is to raise questions which seem to be important and pertinent.

Child-Rearing and Family Life Patterns: Their Association With Academic Achievement

The subcultural child-rearing patterns more characteristic of the very poor, as they may relate to educational achievement, are presented in Table III, p. 43, along with those that research reveals to be associated with school success.

As in the case of parental patterns more characteristic of the very poor compared to those which research reveals to be related to positive mental health, so, in the educational area, it appears that the parental practices of the severely disadvantaged are in opposition to those that would be conducive to educational achievement. (Attention is again called, however, to the cautionary remarks in Chapter II as to the limitations and qualifications related to available research evidence and to those in Chapter III regarding the impact of the poverty situation.) The patterns presented in Table II, Chapter IV, under the heading of positive mental health apply, although not always directly, to school success, since, in general, the "well adjusted" child tends to get along better in the classroom and to learn more readily than the "poorly adjusted" child. The material presented in Table III, however, bears more specifically on educational achievement as such.

Parental practices which research reveals to be conducive to a child's academic success (on the left side of Table III) suggest, in general, an active, rational, self-confident, and optimistic approach to organized society—a society in which the individual can succeed, providing he acquires a wide range of skills and bends his efforts toward long-range goals. Parents value achievement and believe in its worth, both for themselves and for their children; these values and beliefs affect their practices with their children from infancy onward.[85-94]

Parental patterns associated with their children's achievement are not quite so clear-cut, however, as might appear. For instance, there is evidence that the academic achievement motive may be different for girls than for boys and that parental practices may have a different effect on the sexes in this regard. It may be that girls are more influenced by parental attitudes and practices than boys, in that girls tend to be more oriented toward interpersonal relations while the drives of boys may be more autonomously developed. There are indications, according to some investigators, that boys, more than girls, may set their

Table III.—Child-rearing patterns reported to be more characteristic of families of children who are educationally achieving compared with relevant patterns reported to be more characteristic of very poor families

CONDUCIVE (Refs. 66, 85-94)	LOW-INCOME (Refs. 2, 3, 4, 9, 20, 26, 32, 35, 46, 76-86)
1. Infant and child given freedom within consistent limits to explore and experiment.	1. Limited freedom for exploration (partly imposed by crowded and dangerous aspects of environment).
2. Wide range of parent-guided experiences, offering visual, auditory, kinesthetic, and tactile stimulation from early infancy.	2. Constricted lives led by parents: fear and distrust of the unknown.
3. Goal-commitment and belief in long-range success potential.	3. Fatalistic, apathetic attitudes.
4. Gradual training for and value placed on independence.	4. Tendency for abrupt transition to independence: parents tend to "lose control" of children at early age.
5. Educational - occupational success of parents; model as continuing "learners" themselves; high achievement needs of parents.	5. Tendency to educational-occupational failure; reliance on personal versus skill attributes of vocational success.
6. Reliance on objective evidence.	6. Magical, rigid thinking.
7. Much verbal communication, with a flexible, conceptual style and emphasis on both speaking and listening.	7. Little verbal communication, especially of an interactive, conceptual, flexible kind.
8. High value placed on academic achievement.	8. Academic achievement not highly valued.
9. Democratic, rather than authoritarian child-rearing attitudes.	9. Authoritarian child-rearing attitudes.
10. Collaborative attitudes toward the school system.	10. Fear and distrust of the school system.
11. Values placed on abstractions.	11. Pragmatic, concrete values.

own internal standards for achievement.[85] It is also likely that boys are more affected by peer group attitudes than girls are. This proposition is still in the "iffy" stage, since other studies suggest that the achievement behaviors of boys, more than of girls, are strongly affected by parental attitudes and behaviors,[86] especially as these relate to maternal patterns.

There are also indications from studies of middle-class groups that a coercive rather than a lenient parental approach is more conducive to achievement in boys.[85] There are other clues, however, to the effect that maternal warmth and nurturant support may be more effective, over time, than maternal coerciveness in promoting the intellectual growth of boys.[86] These findings may or may not have relevance to boys from very poor homes. Studies of predominantly middle-class groups also suggest that girls who have strong needs for intellectual achievement are apt to have fathers who encourage them in intellectual pursuits and spend time with them in intellectual activities. They also tend to have mothers who push them for achievement.[87]

Other studies reveal that upwardly mobile lower-class boys, although friendly with their parents, tend not to have a strong identification with them.[96] They generally reject their own peer groups early in life and engage in more middle-class types of efforts, such as studying hard in school and conforming to the school's expectations. They are most likely to do this if their parents have high aspirations for their children's education and if they identify with their parents' aspirations rather than with their parents' behavior.[95] Men who have reached a high occupational level in business but who come from lower-class homes are found to have come from families in which a strong, dominating mother encouraged their upward mobility and discouraged an attachment to a weak father.[93] There are indications that identification with a middle-class male, such as a teacher or group leader, facilitates the upward mobility of such lower-class boys.[96]

There is ample evidence that the lower-class boy has an especially difficult time in school. Boys in general, compared to girls, tend to do less well in academic settings below the college level.[93] On the average, they are more apt to be retarded in grade placement; more are considered discipline problems; and more fail to graduate from high school. Their difficulties appear to be related to a complex of such factors as their slower rate of development, constitutional and cultural imperatives that tend to orient them toward physical rather than verbal activity, and the generally feminine orientation of most public schools, especially in the elementary grades.

Academic problems more characteristic of boys, as a group, are likely to be compounded for the lower-class boy. McKinley,[5] quoting from a number of studies, including his own, points out the problems that lower-class boys have in identifying with their fathers in a variety of life patterns, including the educational-vocational role. (See also p. 37.) As previously suggested, however, it appears to be to the advantage of the boy from a chronically poor family if he does not emulate his father's educational and occupational patterns, since such fathers typically have very little education and few occupational skills. Problems arise in a variety of ways, of course, if the lower-class boy identifies with his mother's occupational role. (See Chapter IV.) Thus, as already indicated, if current theories are correct, it appears to be imperative that boys from very poor homes find masculine identification models that represent educational and occupational success, if they are to be upwardly mobile. Girls from such homes also apparently need feminine models of this sort, but the problem would seem to be less acute for them.

While the details of the association between parental practices and the achievement of sons and daughters at various age levels are not clear, it is clear that parental patterns and children's educational success tend to be associated. As in the case of the discussion related to mental health, however, this association is not necessarily a simple one-to-one cause and effect relationship. (See p. 13 above, as well as discussion to follow on p. 27.)

The parental patterns more characteristic of the very poor, in reference to educational achievement, seem to be oriented towards an anticipation of failure and a distrust of middle-class institutions, such as the schools. Constriction in experience, reliance on a physical rather than verbal style, a rigid rather than flexible approach, preference for concrete rather than abstract thinking, reliance on personal attributes rather than training or skills, a tendency toward magical rather than scientific thinking: these values and attitudes provide poor preparation and support for many of the children of the very poor as they struggle to meet the demands of the middle-class oriented school.

Along these lines, McKinley cites studies summarized by Bronfenbrenner[90] which show that middle-class parents make greater demands for school achievement and length of school attendance. The following relationship is reported: greater permissiveness among middle-class parents than among working-class parents regarding the satisfaction of the child's desires and needs but a generally higher demand for performance, especially in the mastery of tasks and school. McKinley writes:

> "What general meaning might these have and what general consequences might result in the different social classes? One interpretation seems meaningful. The lower-class parent is communicating to the child inaction and 'don't.' The child is punished severely for making errors and is not particularly encouraged to perform. By contrast, the middle-class parent seems to be communicating action and performance, even if it is occasionally bad action or in error. The former seems to be the typical atmosphere of a traditional and stable (or rigid) society. The latter

attitude is typical of the dominant values of the trial-and-error, bustling, achieving American society."[5]

Cultural "Deprivation," Growth of Intelligence, and Learning

There is considerable evidence that the subcultures of the families of poverty tend to have a particularly adverse effect during the child's infancy and preschool years.[80, 81, 83, 91, 92] The dangers of so-called cultural deprivation — a better term would be cultural maladaptation—to the very young has been well publicized of late. While emphasis is placed on some striking evidence as to the importance of an intellectually and educationally enriched environment during the early years of life, question is raised about how firm and how generalizable this evidence is.

According to a recently published review and analysis by Bloom,[83] the developmental curves of a number of human characteristics (such as height, intelligence, and academic achievement) are highly similar for all traits, as revealed by a number of longitudinal studies that have been carried out over the past 50 years. He arrives at this conclusion by statistical manipulations of the data from these various studies in such a way that (at least to his satisfaction) allowances are made for (1) the variability in the samples used in these studies, (2) the comparability, and (3) the reliability of the different measurement systems used in different studies. Also he reports that when data from longitudinal studies are compared to cross-sectional ones, there is remarkable agreement between them when the various measurement instruments used are statistically "corrected" to make them comparable.

From an analysis of these studies, some basic deductions are postulated by him, as follows:

1. There are fundamental *laws* in human development rather than trends.

2. Growth and development are not in equal units per unit of time. "For each stable characteristic there is usually a period of relatively rapid growth as well as periods of relatively slow growth. Although it is not invariably true, the period of most rapid growth is likely to be in the early years, and this is then followed by periods of less and less rapid growth. The differential rate of growth with time appears to be of greatest significance for attempts to influence growth and development and for further research on the many problems of predicting and understanding growth. . . . The importance of the influences which affect the growth of such characteristics is likely to be far greater in the periods of most rapid development than it is, at

least quantitatively, in the periods of least rapid development. . . . It will be noted that, with the exception of school achievement, the most rapid period for the development of the above characteristics [Figure 1, below] is in the first five years of life."

Figure 1. Age at which half the total growth that will occur by ages 18–20 has taken place.

Height	age 2½
General intelligence	age 4
*Aggressiveness in males	age 3
*Dependence in females	age 4
General school achievement	grade 3

***The above chart is from Bloom, op. cit. Those characteristics which are starred seem to the present writer to have limited support from research for inclusion in the above figure as prepared by Bloom. Further investigations may or may not support these findings, although psychiatric theory and experience would seem generally to confirm such formulations.**

Individual and Social Class Variability: Some Evidence and Some Speculation

Bloom's postulate that general intelligence has grown to half its full potential by age four may or may not prove to be a defensible basic principle. Research evidence in this area is highly various and stems from a number of different schools of theory and investigation. Here again, a full exploration of the issues and evidence involved is far beyond the limits of this paper. However, a few relevant points are made here, and relevant but contradictory ones appear on pages 50–51. While evidence summarized by Bloom and the researchers quoted on pages 52–53 points to general laws and principles, other evidence, more focused on individuals, points up the variability of individuals in reference to these (possible) laws. Reports by Bayley[86] and by Honzik, Macfarlane, and Allen[98] from their longitudinal studies indicate, among other things, that correlations between measured intelligence between the ages of three and adulthood are only .50, but rise to .80 by age six. According to these and other researches, prediction of adult intelligence from scores obtained by children is highly questionable before the child has reached the age of six. Even with relative *group* stability of measured intelligence reached by age six, individuals have been found to fluctuate in this regard by as much as 50 points during the school years. And only 15 percent of Bayley's subjects were found to maintain as little as 10 points fluctuation in measured intelligence during the growth from childhood through adolescence. Although studies have shown that changes upward in measured intelligence of children tend to be correlated with high educational level in parents, other fluctuations upward and downward in I.Q. are frequently found among children for no readily apparent reasons.

In commenting on this and other evidence, Tyler[89] writes, "Variation in growth curves [of intelligence] from individual to individual has become apparent whenever longitudinal studies have been undertaken."

It is quite possible that social class factors have not been considered enough in various respects when generalizations are made from research evidence, such as that evidence used by Bloom.[83] For instance, nearly all of the studies on which Bloom's conclusions are based contain a predominantly middle-class or upper middle-class sample. It seems possible that such groups would tend to be more generally representative and more homogeneous in respect to measured intelligence than would a lower-lower-class group. There are a number of clues that lend tentative support to this theory:

In the first place, the scores of the majority of individuals in middle-class groups in respect to measured intelligence and educational achievement would probably tend to be distributed fairly close to, but somewhat above, the mean (average) of the normal distribution of the total population. The variability of this group of people, in respect to tested intelligence and educational achievement, would tend, therefore, to be relatively small. Thus, statements about middle-class people from group measures of this sort would tend to be more accurate than statements about more deviant—or atypical—groups. For example, lower-lower-class groups, who have been found, on the average, to obtain considerably lower intelligence test and academic achievement scores, are much farther from the mean, as a group, than are the middle class. Thus, conclusions about their measurements, derived from average measurements, should tend to be more hazardous (and even more so, when research rests largely on middle-class populations). (See also Chapter II, p. 11.)

Beyond this rather theoretical notion lie other more concrete concepts in reference to the probably greater variability in measured intelligence and educational achievement of lower-lower-class groups. Not only would such persons tend, as a group, to be farther from the average than middle-class members, they may also well be more variable as individuals within their own group. For example, since there are more barriers to educational, occupational, and economic success for lower-lower-class groups than for other ones, highly intelligent, academically successful individuals from very poor families may be excessively barred from using their potential. This would be especially true of nonwhites. Conversely, retarded, minimally educated individuals would tend to be overrepresented in lower-lower-class groups, partly because of a probable drift downward from higher socioeconomic levels of some such persons as they reach adulthood. Thus, there may be an accretion, over time, of a disproportionate number of mentally dull people among the very poor. Because of barriers to upward mobility for the very poor (especially nonwhite), highly intelligent, lower-lower-class individuals and because of the "artificial" accretion of the retarded and dull to the lowest socieconomic class level, it is to be expected that a greater range of measured intelligence and greater variability among very poor individuals would obtain. One of the arresting pieces of evidence that support this theory is presented in Figure 2 below, adapted from evidence reported by Harrell and Harrrell.[107]

It can be observed from Figure 2 data that, as one goes down the occupational scale, from professional, to skilled-labor, to unskilled-labor groups, the following measures change: The average measured intelligence scores become lower; the range of intelligence test scores grows wider, and the variability within a group (standard deviation) increases in size. One reason for the increase in range and variability of these scores, as one goes down the occupational scale, is that, in general, only persons of above-average intelligence would be able to survive the necessary educational training required for most professions, whereas unskilled occupations require only limited intelligence but do not exclude those of superior ability. Another reason, of course, is the barriers to higher education for the poor.

Figure 2. [Partial Listing] Mean GCT Standard Scores, Standard Deviations and Range of Scores of 18,782 AAF White Enlisted Men by Civilian Occupation

(Harrell and Harrell, 1945)

Occupation	N	M	Median	Standard Deviation	Range
Accountant	172	128.1	128.1	11.7	94-157
Lawyer	94	127.6	126.8	10.9	96-157
Engineer	39	126.6	125.8	11.7	100-151
Lathe Operator	172	108.5	109.4	15.5	64-147
Receiving and Shipping Checker	281	107.6	108.9	15.8	52-151
Sheet Metal Worker	498	107.5	108.1	15.3	62-153
Laborer	856	95.8	97.7	20.1	26-145
Barber	103	95.3	98.1	20.5	42-141
Lumberjack	59	94.7	96.5	19.8	46-137
Farmer	700	92.7	93.4	21.8	24-147
Farmhand	817	91.4	94.0	20.7	24-141
Miner	156	90.6	92.0	20.1	42-139
Teamster	77	87.7	89.0	19.6	46-145

The likelihood of greater variability in a number of traits among the very poor seems to the author to be an important matter to consider for further investigation and in interpretation of research evidence. (See also Chapter II, pp. 11, 13.)

Blatt has also provided interesting evidence to the effect that the subcultures of poverty and the urban slum environment do not have a universally depressing effect on the intelligence and academic achievement of the very poor. He concluded, in a recent investigation[100] of the relationship between social class and intellectual and academic growth, that, "although all our families [in a random sample of families in a very poor mostly nonwhite Boston slum] could be classified as culturally deprived and although there were inordinate amounts of school failure and inattention to intellectual stimulation in these homes, it was noteworthy that none of our families could be classed as 'cultural-familial mental retardates' . . . it appeared . . . that the occurrence of mental retardation in the parent is relatively independent of its occurrence in his child." Blatt found, for instance, that within the same family, parents varied greatly in their academic achievement and that siblings also showed great variations from very poor to excellent and were not closely associated with the educational levels of their parents.

He and others have also found that mildly mentally retarded children of preschool age, without central nervous system defect, were extremely difficult to locate, even when special efforts were made to locate them in neighborhoods where one would expect to find them in fair number. "One possibility, of course, is that the intelligence tests measure different abilities and behaviors in the preschool period than in the school years. However, there is no evidence that this possibility could account for more than a part of the difficulty in case finding. Another possibility assumes that, in as yet undetermined ways, introducing these children into the school setting maximizes a conflict between the home and school cultures, producing attitudes toward learning and self that negatively affect test performance."[100]

Enrichment Focused on Early Childhood: Some Pros and Cons

Despite the above questioning of Bloom's conclusions, they would seem to have some potency and may point to *general* policy, especially if considerations of individual and (possible) social class variability are borne in mind. Bloom[83] hypothesizes that ". . . a characteristic can be more drastically affected by the environment in its most rapid period of growth than in its least rapid period of growth . . . variations in the environment could have no further effect on that characteristic once a characteristic has reached its complete development (height at age 20, intelligence or I.Q. at about age 20, etc.). Similarly, in a period of very *little development* of a characteristic, the variations in the environment could have very little effect on that characteristic."

The present writer questions the complete validity of Bloom's propositions regarding the lack of impact of the environment on human characteristics, such as intelligence, after the characteristic has reached "complete" development. Whereas there are quantitative, though incomplete, data on the height of individuals after age 20, there have been few systematic, longitudinal studies, with adequate samples, of intelligence in human beings after age 20. Cross-sectional studies of adult intelligence are few[99,101] and are necessarily biased to an unknown degree by the nature of adult sample selection, problems in adult motivation regarding tests, and the differential impact of the cultural climate at different time periods. Thus, although a 60-year-old cohort may have a lower average measured intelligence than a 40-year-old one, this does not necessarily indicate a decline in intelligence with age, partly because 40-year-olds in American society in the 20th century have been exposed to a far more stimulating educational and cultural climate during their entire life span than 60-year-olds.

Although Bloom's data and deductions are impressive regarding the extreme importance of the preschool years in the development of intelligence and are supported by the data and deductions of a host of other investigators, it does not necessarily follow that the human potential for further growth in measured intelligence is nil by the age of 20. No systematic, experimental efforts have been made to test this assumption. Moreover, society assumes that the 20-year-old adult, especially the adult of low socioeconomic status, has "had his chance" at being cared for and educated. Now he must "settle down" with whatever mental equipment and skills he has and "make his own way." It would seem both humane and socially strategic to test whether enrichment programs for adults, including a psychologically therapeutic and stimulating climate, economic security, and adequate medical care might not result in increased measured and/or effective intelligence for at least some individuals. Since such abilities are so important for adults, as wage-earners, parents, marital partners, and community members, it seems dangerous and harsh to write them off as unmodifiable in such a crucial area. Present job-training and literacy training programs represent a small, but too limited, attempt to provide further educational opportunities for adults.

In an intensive overview and analysis of individual growth and change in reference to intelligence and personality changes over the total lifespan, Leona Tyler[99] makes the following summarizing statement:

> "Cross-sectional studies of the performance of different adult age groups on intelligence tests indicated a decline from the twenties on, with the magnitude of the decrement depending to a large extent on the

type of task involved. Scores on vocabulary tests and tests involving elementary-school subject matter stayed up throughout middle age. Scores on performance tests and tests requiring rapid adaptation to new situations declined markedly. Speed tests declined more than power tests.

"Longitudinal studies have typically shown increases rather than decreases in most of these types of test, at least into the fifties. Evidence for a decline in the sixties and seventies has been obtained in longitudinal as well as cross-sectional research.

"In the field of special abilities and aptitudes, the greatest decline is for perceptual tasks of all kinds. Motor skills are maintained fairly well throughout middle age. Learning and memorizing are somewhat less efficient with advancing age, especially the learning of skills that involve the breaking of old habits. Personality differences between various age groups are slight, and the possibility of excellent adjustment for older persons has been demonstrated.

"For most types of outstanding achievement, the peak years come before forty, although persons of all ages have produced masterpieces and important ideas."

She also points out that these findings apply to group trends and that variations in reference to individuals must always be taken into account. For instance, she and others have suggested that intelligence may remain on the same level or may even increase during the middle and later years of life for those persons who are actively engaged in intellectual pursuits; studies of groups of professional people have, for example, suggested this. No studies of measured intelligence, over time, are available that focus on poorly educated, unskilled occupational groups. As indicated above, experimental investigations are in order along these lines. Basic data, without experimental intervention, are also needed.

The same general line of reasoning as that advanced in reference to adults may be applied to Bloom's propositions that environmental factors have very little impact at periods of relatively slow development, such as late childhood and adolescence. Although intervention strategies may be less effective at this time than earlier, experimentation is still called for in order to test his proposition more fully. There is considerable evidence, for instance, that appropriate corrective measures may help a seemingly retarded older child "catch up in a hurry" and make what is usually two or more years of growth in a year or less.

Bloom buttresses his own findings with those of other investigators to make an impressive case for heavy emphasis on the enrichment of the learning environment during the early years of life. While a full detailing of his remarks and those of others is beyond the scope of this paper, some of the more striking relevant findings and deductions are presented here in brief. (The nature of the negatively accelerated human development curve is not presented below because this has been explored more fully in the preceding pages.)

1. Much of human development is sequential in nature, so that individual characteristics in the present are built on preceding ones that

are similar or associated. Evidence from animal experiments such as those performed by Hebb;[102] Erikson's formulations of personality development;[103] Piaget's,[104] Gesell's,[105] Havighurst's,[106] and Hunt's[92] presentations all attest to this proposition, although each investigator approaches it from a somewhat different point of view. Moreover, Bernstein[76] and others point up the crucial nature of early verbal learning and its cumulative impact on other learning skills.

2. Learning theory and research demonstrate that it is much easier to learn something new than to eradicate one set of learnings and put others in their place. It also suggests, on the basis of animal research, that there may well be critical periods in learning in the early history of the organism, that early learning at a critical period is strongly imprinted, and that learning which fails to take place at periods critical for total development may never take place or may take place with inadequate effectiveness. The "critical period of learning" theory is yet to be adequately substantiated by research with human beings.

Evidence and concepts have been presented for and against a policy devoted to a heavy emphasis on "preschool enrichment" especially designed for "culturally deprived" children. In a society with *limited* corrective resources for educational and intellectual development, it would seem strategic to invest most of these resources in programs of this sort. In a society such as that of the United States in the mid-sixties, however, such a "bargain hunter's" approach is not necessary if the public is sufficiently convinced that educational and allied services are worth an investment for adults as well as for children and youth. This comment particularly applies to strategies for dealing with the educational-intellectual problems of our population at this particular point in time, since we have in our society many older children, adolescents, and adults who have suffered in infancy and early childhood from deprivations affecting the development of their full learning potential.

If, through an exceptionally far-sighted and competent series of public programs, we could provide all infants and preschoolers now at that age with a greatly enriched learning environment and the requisite conditions that go with it, such as adequate housing, medical care, nutrition, and positive family experiences, it is quite possible that, in the future, fewer elaborate and expensive developmental programs would be necessary for those above age six. Theoretically, at least they would (in general) be far more able to proceed successfully through school and into employment than is now the case for the disadvantaged (considered as a group). Theoretically, also, they would become so much more effective as parents that powerfully enriching public programs for *their* progeny would be far less necessary.

However, despite the clear importance of an adequate learning environment for individuals at many ages and stages, and especially for the very young, a too-enthusiastic endorsement of such programming as a cure-all—or cure-most—for the educational problems of the poor may lead to disillusionment. It must be recognized that education and intelligence are based on a multitude of factors, that there is a wide range of individual difference, and that further experimentation and evaluation are essential.

Summary

This chapter has touched on a wide range of concepts and bodies of research. For the sake of greater clarity, a summary of the main points is in order. These are:

a. Evidence as to the child-rearing and family life patterns more characteristic of the very poor than of other socioeconomic groups strongly suggests that these patterns tend to be highly deficient in reference to the development of the child's intellectual and attitudinal preparation for school achievement.

b. The impact of these parental patterns may well be different for boys than for girls.

c. Evidence and theory from a number of large bodies of research strongly indicate that human growth, including intellectual growth, follows a basic general pattern, with the first few years of life the most crucial, both from the point of view of rapidity of growth and from the point of view of their significance for later development.

d. Other evidence, however, points to the immense variability of individual growth patterns and the relatively low correlations in measured intelligence when measurements at ages three or four are compared to measurements of the same group at age 18 or so. It is possible that there is a greater degree of variability in reference to measured intelligence within lower-lower-class groups than within middle-class ones. Generalizing from predominantly middle-class data to lower-lower-class individuals and groups may be especially hazardous for this and other reasons.

e. Measured intelligence and educational achievement are associated with a large number of variables and interact with them in complex and multitudinous ways. These variables include genetic, health, motivational, personality, experiential, and environmental factors.

f. While enriched educational experience for very young children in low-income families is apparently a sound general policy, it also is relevant to experiment further with enrichment experiences for older groups, including adults. It is also relevant to consider factors other than cognitive deprivation as an impediment to intellectual development and educational achievement. It is likely that a variety of strategies based on individual diagnoses is called for.

CHAPTER SIX

Social Acceptability

The acceptance or nonacceptance of the child of poverty into the middle-class mainstream of society has received little specific attention from researchers. The alienation of the poor from this mainstream has been amply documented and discussed in the foregoing pages. *Anti*-social, deviant behavior, such as delinquency, has been the subject of considerable research, but this topic is beyond the scope of this particular paper, since it is such a large and specialized area of research and program concern.

The gap between the middle-class norms of the school and the poor child's behavior style has already been noted here, with specific attention to its meaning for his education. However, the school is also an important part of the child's social world and the low-income child in the (mainly) middle-class school room is generally observed to be a social outcast.

Since children's perceptions of social class and ethnic differences increase as they mature, the very poor child is apt to find himself increasingly isolated socially, as well as academically, as he proceeds through the grades. This social isolation from the main culture has particularly severe implications because of the developmental psycho-social tendency for children to reach out to relationships with their peers and extra-familial adults as they mature. The growth in the size and nature of the "urban ghetto" and the middle-class escape to the suburbs have tended to create schools of one social class in many areas. (As previously mentioned, problems specifically related to race are not within the scope of this paper. See pp. 17, 21, Chapter III, however, for a brief related discussion.) Although the one-social-class school (lower-lower-class, as referred to here) might be viewed as having certain advantages in reducing the poor child's sense of social isolation, it is obvious that such schools would tend to isolate these children severely from potential socializing experiences that might facilitate their upward mobility.

Little research evidence is available, in general, on the relationship between the child-rearing and family life patterns of the nuclear family and a child's being considered socially acceptable. Only a few studies have been made which especially focus on social class and social acceptability of children. Most of these studies have been made in school settings. Since a socially acceptable child reportedly has a number of characteristics in common with the "well adjusted child," the reader is referred to Table II for findings related to child-rearing patterns of the very poor compared to those that are associated with "good adjustment." (See also pp. 30–31 for a discussion of some of the problems regarding the definition of "adjustment.") Specific characteristics of the socially acceptable child are given in Table IV, with a comparison of the relevant patterns of the very poor. The "socially acceptable" characteristics refer to behavioral characteristics of children who have been found by a variety of sociometric and other devices to be given a high social rating by their peers—mostly their school mates.

The relatively meagre chance afforded a very poor child to acquire a "socially acceptable" rating is strikingly apparent, according to findings shown in this table. As in the case of the generally accepted criteria for "good adjustment" or positive mental health, so the characteristics of the socially acceptable child are solidly middle-class. If studies were done in social settings that were predominantly lower-class, other traits characteristic of socially acceptable children would probably emerge.

As suggested above, the conditions of poverty itself and the poverty environment call for adaptive behaviors that are not middle-class. Despite this observation, the implication does not necessarily follow that the social patterns more characteristic of the poor are optimal ones even within their own social milieu. There is considerable evidence that the urban social life of the very poor may hold little security or pleasure for them, especially in public housing projects or other congested dwelling units in urban areas. There tends to be a sense of alienation within neighborhood groups, a sense of fear and distrust of each other, and frequent outbursts of physical violence. Although Cohen[37] and others describe an informal network of mutual aid in low-income peer groups, there are also a number of studies showing the constricted, lonely lives of the very poor, with relatives often being the only close social contact for adults—and these contacts often being conflict-laden. At least from the middle-class point of view, very poor children tend to grow up in homes in which they have little chance to learn skills in interpersonal social relationships or to develop attitudes of trust in others. This apparent lack of rewarding social contacts may contribute to the (hypothetically) depressed life style of many of the very poor. (See Chapter IV.)

Table IV.—Behavioral characteristics reported to be more characteristic of socially acceptable school children compared to the relevant child-rearing patterns that are reportedly more characteristic of very poor families. (See also Table II.)

CONDUCIVE (Refs. 32, 108-115)	**LOW-INCOME** (Refs. 5, 17, 18, 20, 32, 55)
1. Social skills in dress, manners, speech, games, etc., according to middle-class norms.	1. Little skill in prevalent middle-class behaviors.
2. Sensitivity to feelings and attitudes of others.	2. Slight awareness of subtleties of interpersonal relations.
3. Ability to be flexible & adaptable to group decisions.	3. Tendency to be rigid & non-conforming to middle-class norms.
4. Good impulse control.	4. Poor impulse control.
5. Cheerful, happy, self-assured attitude.	5. Low self-esteem, distrust, tendency to hostile aggression and/or withdrawal.
6. Respect for other children's property rights.	6. Ambivalent attitudes towards property rights.
7. Middle-class (or higher) socioeconomic status.	7. Lower-lower class.
8. Accepting of self and others.	8. Alienation from middle-class; fear, distrust, hostility.
9. Academically successful.	9. Academic failures.
10. Values of neatness and cleanliness.	10. Little value placed on neatness and cleanliness.

However, most of the studies which yield evidence as to the social deprivation of the very poor have been done in large cities, such as New York, Chicago, and St. Louis. They have also, for the most part, been carried out in large public housing projects. Whether or not the same general principle of alienation, violence, and fear would be present in other poverty groups in other environments is not clear. Also, it is not clear whether middle-class urban residents in large apartment dwellings are strikingly different in their fear and distrust of their neighbors, although it is known that they, more than the very poor, tend to have a wide social network through a number of community organizations.

To an unknown extent, in-migration from rural to urban areas probably raises new problems in interpersonal conflict and insecurity between old and new residents in poverty neighborhoods. Considerable observation suggests that urban renewal programs have tended in some areas to upset closely-knit neighborhoods that had a good deal of positive meaning to a number of the poor.

Further studies are needed as to the social interaction patterns of low-income individuals in a variety of environments and in a variety of groups. Moreover, the meaning and behavioral outcomes of these patterns require objective evaluation. For instance, most of the investigators seems to have focused on the deficits of the very poor in reference to their social behavior. This point of view of these researchers is probably highly subjective and middle-class. They may see the ready manifestations of fear and violence and overlook possible positives in poverty groups that some social workers and others have noted, such as an easy casualness in relationships, quick humor and quick compassion, ready expressiveness and the capacity to enjoy pleasures of the moment. In other words, qualities such as impulsivity, an expressive life style, lack of goal-commitment, and anti-intellectualism can constitute a contribution, as well as an impediment, to personally satisfying social relationships, especially when these relationships take place within a group that shares similar values.

Be that as it may, deficits in socialization to middle-class norms tend to operate against many lower-lower-class members in obtaining health, welfare, and other community services; to reduce their coping capacity as consumers; and to impede their chances to move into skilled labor or white-collar jobs. Although the subject of delinquency and other forms of deviant behavior is not the focus of this report, the social isolation that is apt to be the lot of the very poor in terms of the larger society quite clearly plays a part in the relatively high rate of illegal activities and conflict with the law in poverty-stricken neighborhoods. Although socialization towards middle-class norms would probably create problems for the poor in the poverty environment, lack of such socialization tends to keep them there. This would seem to be but another aspect of the generation-to-generation poverty syndrome.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Conscience Formation

The acquisition of "sound moral character" is considered to be important for the well-being of the individual and of society. There are many definitions of this concept. It has been used so often by those who would seek to control others through their own particular prescriptions of right or wrong that the terms "good character" or moral behavior tend to have negative connotations to social and behavioral scientists. However, there is general agreement that human beings need control over, or capacity to channel, their own basic drives for self-gratification and self-defense if an organized society is to exist. The terms "conscience" or "superego" tend to be more acceptable than "morality" to those in research and service professions seeking to understand and help people.[115] However, Kohlberg,[116] who has done extensive research in this field, uses the term "moral character" and defines it as the ability to resist temptation and to conform to cultural standards in reference to impulse-control.

The research related to parental patterns that lead to "good moral character," adequate conscience, or superego formation, tended to be scanty during the forties and fifties, although Hartshorne and May developed a series of classic studies in the late twenties.[117] More recently, interest has greatly revived in this area of research. [116, 118-120]

A central difficulty exists in reaching agreement as to what characterizes an adequate conscience—a good moral character—and how these characteristics, once defined, may be objectively measured. Most research has used such concepts as ability to withstand temptation, such as the temptation to lie, cheat, or steal. White and Lippitt, in an analysis of their own research and that of others, found that conscience might be defined as a cluster of correlated traits,[121] generally along the same lines as Kohlberg found.

The investigators are virtually unanimous in their findings that moral character cannot be adequately measured in terms of moral knowledge or attitudes, as revealed by questionnaires, in that there is little association between such knowledge or attitudes and behavioral outcomes. The latter are, of course, the crucial variables.

A central formulation reached by Kohlberg in his overview of relevant research[115] is that ego-strength and "good moral character" are closely associated. The following variables have been found, in a number of studies, to be associated with each other: the ability to—

withstand temptation and to behave honestly;
act in conformance with social norms that require impulse control;
defer immediate gratification in favor of more distant rewards;
maintain focused attention on one task; and
control unsocialized fantasies.

Self-esteem and satisfaction with the environment, and average or superior intelligence, are also variables related to "good moral character." The relationship between these abilities and traits and ego-strength is clear.

Ego-strength, more than severe superego, has been found, through research, to be closely associated with "good moral character." Theoretical formulations proposed by Freud and his followers would also generally support this proposition in that a rigid, severe superego (or conscience) is generally seen as being associated with a weak ego and difficulties in consistent impulse control.

Allied to the above findings are the results of other studies which reveal that parental attempts at specific training in "good habits," such as responsibility and obedience, fail to have an impact on consistent moral behavior.

The parental patterns that have been found by investigators to be associated with "good moral character" and the related behaviors more typical of lower-lower-class parents are presented in Table V, below.

As in the case of other substantive areas discussed in this paper, the child-rearing patterns more characteristic of the very poor seem poorly calculated to develop "good moral character" in many of their children. Of all the positively conducive parental practices associated with "good moral character," affectionate nurturance of the child as a significant, lovable individual and the use of firm, kind, consistent discipline seem to be the most important variables.[116, 121, 113] (For a discussion of "democratic" child-rearing methods see p. 35.)

Along with the contribution which these practices make to the development of ego-strength, there is also the point made by Hoffman[120] in her studies to the effect that physical punishment does not create internalized guilt—and internalized guilt is viewed by her and a number of other behavioral scientists as being essential to moral behavior. In order to internalize guilt, it appears that the child must

Table V.—Child-rearing patterns reported to be characteristic of families of children who are of "good character"* compared with relevant patterns reported to be characteristic of very poor families.

CONDUCIVE	**LOW-INCOME**
(Refs. 116-121)	(Refs. 2-5, 19, 20, 32, 33, 36, 37, 44, 48, 49, 55-57, 76, 122)
1. Democratic child - rearing methods.	1. Authoritarian methods.
2. Mild, reasonable, consistent discipline.	2. Harsh, physical, inconsistent discipline.
3. Child's capacity for moral judgment, according to basic principles, is viewed as a slowly developing ability.	3. Reasons for child's misbehavior tend not to be considered; specific behavioral outcomes rather than principles considered paramount.
4. Moral values are discussed and clarified.	4. Little verbal communication and discussion.
5. Parents set example by their own behavior.	5. Parental behavior more apt to be impulsive and gratification-oriented.

*Defined as including honesty, responsibility, dependability, and ability to resist temptation.

internalize the norms of the parent—or other significant adult—which he does primarily through an identification born of love and admiration for the adult as an ego-ideal. Internalized norms, however, that are inconsistent with the values of the predominant culture might create more, rather than fewer, problems for children whose parents subscribe to a different subcultural system with different values.

As detailed on page 44, there is evidence from studies of upwardly mobile boys who escape from lower-class homes that the escape process entails considerable detachment from the family of origin. Is it possible that highly nurturant, very poor parents who apply consistent discipline to their children in reference to parental values might actually, thereby, inhibit the upward mobility of their progeny? This is one of many questions that might be investigated in studies of very poor children who manage to "escape from the slums" compared to those who don't.

As previously detailed in reference to other major topics in this paper, the standards for "good moral character" used by the investigators and presented here are closely atuned to middle-class norms. (See especially Chapter III.) The lower-lower-class child living in the poverty environment is likely to encounter special difficulties in trying to live in close conformance to such values as consistent honesty and consistent control of his "anti-social" impulses. For the very poor, such honesty and self-control might well be seen as a luxury that can be afforded only by those with a certain reservoir of material and personal security. "Not cheating in school" is often used as a criterion of honesty by researchers. With the educational cards generally stacked against the very poor child, his failure record might well be worse than it usually is, if he consistently abstained from cheating. In fact, research evidence reveals that such traits as not cheating are related to a considerable degree to the situation in which subjects are placed.[120] Likewise, if he practiced middle-class impulse control for such drives as aggression, he might well be ostracized as a "square" and would also tend to lack the requisite skills and style that are needed for self-defense in the slum environment.

Since ego-strength is apparently more important to "good moral character" than moral knowledge, and since the very poor child is far more apt than others to have daily assults on his self-esteem both at home and abroad, it is litttle wonder that the investigators find lower-lower-class children tend to have less favorable ratings as to their moral character than other children do.

To explain a problem, however, is not to cure it. Understandable as the moral behavior of some of the very poor may be, this does not necessarily make it viable in an organized society, especially in a highly urbanized, technical one such as ours. A number of apologists for the poor suggest that these individuals are not immoral or amoral —they simply have a different moral code. Other social scientists, however, hold that effective socialization in a society requires adaptation to that society's norms. When the cultural patterns of a group tend not to deal adequately with social behavior which becomes pathological in a social setting, these patterns are termed dysfunctional by some sociologists. Perhaps some of the cultural patterns of the very poor are, indeed, dysfunctional in modern society.

It could also be pointed out that when impulse controls are weak, this tends to create fear, loneliness, and alienation within the subculture of poverty itself. In effect, many of the very poor may need help with strong impulse controls, both for their own sake and for the sake of the larger society.

Another repeated point: The conditions of poverty must be alleviated in order to make changes in the subcultures of poverty viable and enduring.

And, again, to repeat: The above comments are to be interpreted in a relative sense. The interpretation should not be made that all, or most, of the very poor tend to have character deficiencies, in the middle-class sense. The interpretation should be that it appears that more lower-lower-class children than children from other families would seem to be raised in ways that are nonconducive to self-control and conformity to norms generally held by majority groups.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Family Life Styles

Higher Rate of Marriage Breakdown for the Very Poor

The marital stability of lower-lower-class families is far more precarious than that of other groups. Goode[123] found in 1956 that the divorce rate increases with a decrease in the various indices of socioeconomic status. The unskilled labor group was found to have a divorce rate 2.6 times that of the professional-proprietary group: more than one-fourth of those persons who have only an elementary school education have been married two or more times.

Miller comments[15] that "serial monogamy" (one mate after another) is more characteristic of the very poor and points out that between 25% and 40% of slum families are headed by a woman. One-fourth of the families in the United States with an annual income of less than $3,000 are broken families, while this is true of only one-twelfth of all families in the general population.[124]

Blood and Wolfe,[125] in a 1959 study, came to the conclusion that satisfaction with love and marriage tends to increase for the wife and more companionship is experienced between married couples as one moves up the social scale from lower- to middle- to upper-social class groups.

Rainwater, in a study of the marriages of the very poor,[126] points out that low-income women often see men as dominant, controlling, unpredictable, and powerful—the way the rest of the world is. Husbands also are apt to see themselves as powerless in an unpredictable world, with women being demanding and irrational. He details the psychological distance that tends to exist between husband and wife: the resignation and hopelessness of many wives, the distrustful, hostile attitudes of many husbands, and the planless, impulsive nature of their original drift from a short courtship to marriage. He also found, that the very poor have less knowledge regarding sex relations and conception than other groups do. The lower the socioeconomic status, the less there is knowledge about such matters, and the less there is enjoyment of sex relations, especially on the part of women. "Lower-lower-class men are more apt to regard sex as their right and to use it in a hostile, punitive manner." According to Rainwater, furthermore, the lower-lower-class mother frequently turns to her children, partly out of frustration in her marriage, and tends to see her children as sources of personal pleasure and of proof of herself as a woman.

In a later paper, Rainwater brings together a number of studies and concludes that these characteristics of lower-lower-class relations between the sexes are found in many parts of the world (Mexico, Puerto Rico, England and the United States).[127] This viewpoint is buttressed by Yancey,[128] who adds a number of cities within the United States, as well as Scotland and France. However, as we pointed out in our introduction, while a basic theme may be found in the "culture of poverty," variations on this theme for a variety of subcultures are probable, although they are yet to be clearly defined.

Further indication that lower-class marriages tend to provide less companionship than middle-class ones is provided by studies of California[127] and Nebraska groups[123] as well as of a New England sample.[19] In the latter study Komarovsky found that only one-third of her respondents rated their marriage as happy (compared to about three-fourths of couples in most middle-class samples). The population of this study consisted of two groups: (a) high school graduates whose husbands were generally skilled workmen and (b) less than high school graduates whose husbands were generally unskilled laborers. A number of differences were found between these lower-class and lower-lower-class groups. For instance, compared to the skilled labor group, the lower-lower-class respondents were less likely to value conversation and companionship in marriage and were more apt to view men and women's worlds as being entirely separate. The author comments, in reference to this lack of communication, that barriers to sharing are related to the monotonous and/or technical nature of the husband's job; the husband's feeling that griping is unmanly; his belief that home and job should be kept separate; the general impoverishment of life; and "a trained incapacity to share." As might be expected, more of the lower-lower-class couples in this study population rated their marriages as unhappy.

Komarovsky also found that the less educated men, compared to the high school graduates, found little emotional relief in any form of recreation or social interaction. Their most frequent behavior in coping with conflicts was repression and withdrawal, interspersed with violence and quarreling. There were also higher rates in this group for heavy intoxication after a quarrel. She comments, "Violence decreases and talking out increases as the level of education rises. The most completely estranged are the less educated group." Male domination of the marriage was more common for the less educated group, and wife-beating was more frequent. Among the high school couples, the wife had more social interaction with the community, while the reverse was true for the less educated ones, with the wife having almost no social life outside her family and the husband finding his major social outlets in the tavern.

Both the husbands and the wives in the less educated group had a high frequency of hostile interaction with their siblings and parents—higher than for the high school graduates.

Unemployment and Marital Conflict

Unemployment is a frequent occurrence for the lower-lower-class male, and its deleterious effects are felt keenly in the family. Again, according to Komarovsky, "Unemployment and poverty is a frequent problem. Dread of illness with its cost is very real. Poverty, anxiety about the future, a sense of defeat, bleakness of existence, and failure of children affect these marriages in a number of ways. Men, feeling they are poor providers, become frustrated and anxious. This may lead to drinking, violence, sensitivity to criticism, and withdrawal. Wives become frustrated with their husbands' failures and subject them to criticism. The quality of the marriage plus a helpful network of neighbors and relatives offset in some cases the adverse effects of poverty. Partly because of extreme poverty, higher rates of marriage unhappiness are found for less educated than for high school groups."

The high rate of unemployment for the lower-class Negro male is widely recognized, as is the association between this fact and the higher rates of illegitimacy and marriage breakdown found for Negro families. For example, nonwhite women are three times as likely to have their marriage disrupted as white women, and more often by separation than by divorce. Also, according to the 1960 Census, three-fifths of the white mothers with children under age 18 and no father in the home were divorced or widowed; only 2 percent said they had never been married. By contrast, only one-third of the nonwhite mothers without a husband claimed that they were divorced or widowed, and one in eight said they were never married to the father of their children.[124] Unemployment of lower-class Negro males is not the only reason for the higher rates of marital instability among nonwhites, but a detailed examination of racial differences is not within the major focus of this paper.

Yancey[128] found in a study of families in a St. Louis housing project that marital conflict markedly increased when the husband lost his job and decreased when he gained employment again. An analysis of national figures on unemployment and on divorce and separation shows that a year of high unemployment is followed, in the next year, by high rates of family breakdown. A series of studies of family and marital stability during the great depression[127] generally revealed that unemployment and economic deprivation had their sharpest impact on families that were already unstable and had little adverse impact on family relationships when there was a previous background of personal and interpersonal strength. For the chronically poor, such a background is less likely to exist, and these families, therefore, would seem to be in an especially poor position to cope with poverty and unemployment.

The association between the unemployment or underemployment of husbands and the entry of wives into the labor market is clear. More wives are employed (58 percent) in families where the husband earns less than $1,000 a year and the children are between ages 6–12 than is true for any other group of wives.[31] One-fifth of all mothers of pre-school children whose husbands earn less than $3,000 a year are in the working force, as compared to 7 percent of those wives whose husbands earn over $10,000 a year. This fact becomes more impressive when consideration is given to the findings from a number of studies to the effect that, generally speaking, the adjustment of children is not adversely affected by a mother's employment *providing that adequate, continuous care by a responsible adult is available for the children.*[29] A 1958 study made by the Bureau of Family Services of ADC mothers revealed that one-sixth of the mothers whose children are under age 12 were employed either part-time or full-time.[30] One in seven of these employed mothers had no daytime child-care arrangements. Other studies show that lower-lower-class working mothers earn so little that it is impossible for them to purchase adequate care of their children and have any significant margin left from their wages.

Many poor women would seem to have an exceptionally difficult life. If their husbands are in the home, they generally give little help in tasks related to homemaking and child rearing, since these tasks are apt to be rigidly proscribed as women's work. If their husbands earn little, poor women are more likely than other women to add an outside job to their busy lives. Women at this level generally do not prefer to work nor do their husbands favor this.[19] The jobs that are open to them offer little in the way of either interest or income. There are indications from research that a woman's employment may have an adverse effect on her children if (a) her husband is opposed to her working and (b) she does not wish to take employment.[31] These factors, plus the probability that adequate substitute child-care arrangements cannot be made, suggest strongly that a poor mother's employment is likely to have a more adverse effect on her children than would generally be the case for families on a higher socioeconomic level. This may be even truer for very poor working mothers and their children in a one-parent household.

Problems in Family Planning

Along with the stronger likelihood of an unhappy marriage, greater social constriction, and heavier work burdens experienced by very poor mothers goes their greater difficulty in controlling the number of their pregnancies. In a recent national study,[140] it was learned that, regardless of social class, the young women respondents generally stated that they preferred to have between two and four children. However, the actual births and expectations of women who had been married for a few years showed clear class differences: the lower the socioeconomic status, the larger the families and the greater the number of children expected. Very poor mothers, far more than others, had more children than they desired. While 80 percent of the women with at least some high school education eventually used some form of family planning measures[140] in their married lives, only 60 percent of those with grammar school education did so. Rainwater's studies on this subject[6] showed that attitudes of apathy, fatalism, magical thinking, and lack of future planning played a part in the higher rate of failure of the very poor to control the size of their families.

A recent[141] reanalysis of income by family size revealed that fewer families can be classed as poor than was the case for earlier analyses. However, when family size and family income needs are considered, it is revealed that more large families are classified as being below the poverty line. Moreover, families of six or more children have a median income that is, on the average, 24 percent lower than the income for the average family of three children.

Husbands and wives on the lowest socioeconomic level tend to have a poorer start in marriage than other couples and the same is likely to be true for their children. Many are high school dropouts (over half, or more). One result of this is that they are likely to be forced into adult roles earlier than other adolescents. A young person out of school is not given the sanctions for adolescent behavior and the security of protection that students are given. This may be one reason that more of the very poor drift into marriage in their middle or late teens, often following a premarital pregnancy. Added to their youth,[129] lack of education and poor general preparation for marriage and parenthood, there is the likelihood that the young husband will find either a very inadequate job or no job at all. The life experiences that such young couples have had growing up in their own homes and in the poverty environment offer seriously reduced opportunities for a satisfying, stable marriage and family life of their own.

Research Evidence—Factors Related to Marital Unhappiness

Research evidence related to factors associated with marital stability and the relevant experiences of the very poor are presented in Table VI.

"Good marital adjustment," used as the criterion for success in marriage and presented on the left side of this table, has been defined in most of the related research as self-rated marital happiness. Lack of divorce or separation has also been the criterion in some research. While

Table VI.—Attitudes and behaviors revealed by research to be more prevalent among low-income men and women compared with attitudes and behaviors reported to be associated with "good" marital adjustment*

CONDUCIVE TO "GOOD MARITAL ADJUSTMENT" (Refs. 130-139)	**LOW-INCOME BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES** (Refs. 2, 4, 5, 7, 11-14, 19-22 37, 123-129)
1. Happiness of parents' marriage and lack of divorce in family of origin.	1. High divorce and separation rates of the very poor.
2. High level of self-perceived childhood happiness.	2. Research evidence lacking; professional observation suggests higher levels of childhood unhappiness among very poor.
3. Mild but firm discipline during childhood with only moderate punishment.	3. Severe, harsh, inconsistent punishment in childhood.
4. Adequate sex information, especially from encouraging parents.	4. Repressive, punitive attitudes toward sex.
5. Substantial time of acquaintance and engagement before marriage; lower rates of premarital pregnancy.	5. Short courtship, marriage often after pregnancy has occurred.
6. Marriage in the middle 20's or later.	6. Teen-age marriages common.

Table VI.—Continued

CONDUCIVE TO "GOOD MARITAL ADJUSTMENT" (Refs. 130-139)	LOW-INCOME BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES (Refs. 2, 4, 5, 7, 11-14, 19-22 37, 123-129)
7. Mutual enjoyment of sex relations.	7. Sex regarded as enjoyable only for male, women regarding it as source of economic security; basically exploitative on both sides.
8. Open expression of affection between sexes, confidence in each other, equalitarian, free communication.	8. Little expressed affection, male in dominant role, women aligned against men, little communication, attitudes of mutual exploitation.
9. Joint participation in outside interests, friends in common.	9. Masculine and feminine worlds separate, few friends.
10. Residence stable, in single home.	10. Residence in multiple dwellings, frequent moving.
11. Education at least through high school.	11. Education less than high school.
12. High economic level, income at least $5,000 per year.	12. Low socioeconomic level, income less than $3,000 per year.

*Insofar as studies have been done concerning differences between Negroes and whites, findings indicate apparent differences largely disappear when data are carefully analyzed in terms of strictly comparable socioeconomic levels. Thus studies reporting racial differences may be reporting class differences to a considerable extent.

these criteria are somewhat lacking in precision and subtlety, more satisfactory ones are difficult to devise. Another serious problem obtains in these studies, in that nearly all of the subjects were middle-class in most of them. While working-class subjects were included in a few, it appears that almost no lower-lower-class respondents were obtained. Thus these investigations are most likely to reveal what factors are associated with happy, middle-class marriages within the middle-class "happiness" value system.

Although research as to the variables associated with marital stability has not been focused on such global factors (aside from level of education achieved) as those discussed as major topics in this paper, it seems likely that such stability would tend to be associated strongly with positive mental health and, perhaps somewhat less so, with social acceptability and "good moral character." Since the evidence already presented under these headings indicates that the child-rearing patterns more characteristic of the very poor are less likely to promote these factors in their children, the chances for marital stability of this group would seem to be considerably prejudiced for many from infancy on through adulthood. This observation is strengthened by a number of the findings in Table VI which point up the importance of early childhood experiences in the family of orientation for later marital success in the family of procreation.

The added strains for lower-lower-class marriages associated with unemployment have been mentioned in general and, specifically, as they apply to current, youthful marriages of this group. It is also relevant to mention the adverse impact of the total poverty environment on family life, especially in reference to its many threats to the already insecure new, young families. And these young families are important young families, for their own sake, as well as for the sake of the new generation they are founding.

The foregoing presentation has focused on the marital problems of the very poor. That more of them suffer unhappiness and instability in their marital lives than other groups do seems clear. It is relevant to remark again, however, that attention has been fixed on marital dissatisfactions rather than satisfactions. Although *more* of the very poor would seem to have a wide range of dissatisfactions, the fact remains that the majority of them maintain unbroken marriages, the majority rate their marriages as mostly happy, and the majority have children within wedlock. Also, it is quite possible that the very poor are more apt to be open in their complaints about their marriages so that their dissatisfactions are more readily known.

Although it may be too easy to overemphasize the apparent stresses of interparental relations among the very poor, it is probably more dangerous and inhuman to underemphasize them. The conditions of modern society would seem to impose a number of special strains on families in general. However, modern society would also seem to offer a number of positive gains to families in the more affluent groups. The strains are clearly greater for the very poor, and the gains are clearly less.

Strategies for devising a more equal balance of these strains and gains for the chronically poor in our society will be suggested in the following chapter.

CHAPTER NINE

Implications for Some Specific Intervention Strategies

The foregoing research findings and comments have, within limits, a number of implications for intervention strategies. Limits are imposed by the gaps in knowledge that still exist, by the complexities of individual behavior within a subculture, and by the fact that specialists in the treatment professions are far better qualified than the author to design programs. There are also limits imposed by the kinds of questions raised in Chapter III regarding the environment and its associated subcultures. (See Chapter III. Points made there will not be repeated in any detail in this section.) Some suggestions will be made here, with the hope that the specialists will develop further experimental programs related to these and other research clues.

Some General Considerations

From the available evidence, it seems clear that changes in subcultural patterns of a number of very poor people are probably indicated as one of a number of measures designed to facilitate upward mobility for themselves and their children. Unfortunately, planned changes in culture patterns are extremely difficult to effect. Clear knowledge is lacking as to how such changes may occur. That changes do occur is clear from many indications, including that of the history of the United States and including recent, striking cultural changes in this country. It is likely that a number of lower-class families have radically changed their cultural patterns, especially in the last 20 years or so. For example, skilled and semi-skilled laborers who have been able to adapt themselves to socioeconomic changes and opportunities have shown a strong upsurge toward the middle class. It is possible that some families who have not been able to make this upward movement may be particularly resistant to change. It would seem possible that this might be particularly true of white families who have had greater opportunities for upward mobility than have Negro families. The recent strong pushes toward integration in education, employment opportunities, political rights, and, to some extent, housing, might well be accompanied by a rapid movement in upward mobility and cultural change among a large segment of the nonwhite population.

On the subject of cultural change, Elizabeth Herzog[142] has developed a highly pertinent statement, based on her own work and that of others. She writes:

> " 'Know the culture' is the first of five axioms often invoked by those experienced in effective introduction of culture change—axioms which are perhaps a collective equivalent of some casework axioms. The second axiom is: 'Know what change you want to bring about, and how.' The third is: 'Instill motivation for change' . . . If an individual feels he is not part of the great society . . . if he feels that the avenues to its rewards are blocked, then he is unlikely to live by the rules of that society. Some part of him may prefer the rules accepted by those whom the society accepts. But if the goals do not seem accessible to him, he is not motivated to exercise the self-discipline and energy inspired by belief that something is to be gained—or even just that he belongs. . .
>
> "The fourth axiom is: 'Show that change is feasible by giving a taste of success.' This is a principle effective in under-developed countries, in helping school children catch up with their classmates, and also in work with so-called multi-problem families. . . If, in the beginning, tasks and projects are within the grasp of the performer, so that he can believe success is possible and taste its gratifications and results, the mainspring for motivation to further effort has been achieved.
>
> "The fifth axiom is: 'We must want change enough to be willing to pay for it—in whatever currency and amount may be required.' This people [i.e., the tax-paying public] are seldom prepared to do."

Changing Subcultural Patterns

Since it is known that cultural patterns arise to a large extent out of the adaptation of a group to the environmental situation, it is obvious that, unless the environment of the very poor changes, subcultural patterns are unlikely to change. A good deal of present social planning and legislation derives from the recognition that the environment of the very poor requires pervasive changes. Such programs as public housing, urban renewal, expansion of health services, social security and public assistance programs, recently passed legislation in reference to Federal aid to schools in disadvantaged areas, the surplus foods plans, the expansion of the opportunity system under the experimental projects in the prevention of delinquency, and the Economic Opportunity Act are all approaches to enlarging social, economic, and related opportunities for the very poor. (Other programs sponsored by the Federal and State governments and by privately financed groups come to mind, and the foregoing list is not at all an inclusive one.)

Important as these programs are, it is quite possible that other approaches must also be considered. As pointed out earlier in this paper, human behavior is based on factors other than cultural patterns and the environmental situation. In planning programs to help the disadvantaged move into the full advantages of modern society, differential diagnosis of individual capacities is important. Since human behavior is caused by many factors, no one program, nor several programs, will provide solutions to all the problems of all the people. Then, too, it must be recognized that the solutions of some of the problems of some individuals are, at present, unknown. A variety of approaches is needed that will have differential effects on different individuals and different families. Here again, more careful experimentation and evaluation are needed in reference to a variety of programs with a variety of people.

Cultural patterns are not likely to change out of environmental changes alone. The concept of cultural lag has been recognized for a long time. Basically, it proposes that the more abstract, ideational aspects of the culture change more slowly than the concrete aspects that can be readily observed. Thus, such aspects of the culture as values, attitudes, and goals would tend to change more slowly than more concrete aspects, such as housing projects and urban renewal.

It is also known that some individuals are more flexible and ready to change than others. Since characteristics of the lower-lower-class subculture tend to include such traits as rigidity, fatalism, concrete-mindedness, magical thinking, and distrust of prevalent social institutions, it looks as if a large number of very poor people would be especially resistant to change. In some respects, characteristics like these seem to be more typical of rural than of urban cultures. Since many of the very poor are recent migrants from rural to urban areas, it is likely that a good deal of their difficulty may rest in clinging to rural patterns. This has been recognized on a somewhat more superficial level in reference to their difficulties in "learning how to live" in an urban environment.

Less apparent and less obvious difficulties would seem to rest in strongly ingrained attitudes that go deep into total personality functioning. Urban life, with its many complexities and its requirements for rapid role change and personal flexibility, would seem to be particularly difficult for individuals who maintain a basically rigid and fatalistic approach to the environment. The frustrations, deprivations, and threats to the self-esteem offered by the urban complex to the individual who fails to adapt would tend to reinforce rather than alleviate rigidities that hinder adaptation.

Since a rigid, fatalistic, anti-intellectual behavioral style is closely associated with anxiety, it would seem that an important approach to helping many of the very poor would rest, in part, on finding strategies to relieve this anxiety. It has been hypothesized earlier in this paper that many of the very poor, generally speaking, present a "poverty syndrome" that may manifest itself primarily in a chronic psychological depression. With other defenses lacking against this depression, a number of the very poor find temporary escape in such expressive activities as fantasy, dramatic behavior, psychosomatic illnesses, impulsivity, alcohol, and drugs.

Social workers and others who work with members of this group may be able to develop a deeper empathy and understanding if they see beneath the surface of the seeming impulsivity of many of the very poor and interpret it more as a depressed surrender to failure that is perceived as inevitable.

In general, increasing knowledge and awareness of the part that low-income culture patterns may play in affecting the behavior of the poor can be of use to the practitioner in understanding the people with whom he works. A bland assumption, however, that a lower-income person must have a certain kind of "cultural pattern" is clearly dangerous. A keen and sympathetic ear and eye can help the practitioner pick up what the values, goals, and attitudes of a client or student or patient may be and what effect they have on an individual's functioning.

These remarks are related to another concept regarding planned approaches to bringing about changes in cultural styles. Some professionals in the helping professions question the advisability of inducing cultural changes in others. (See also Chapter III.) They have been well schooled in the philosophy that the life styles of people from different backgrounds should be accepted and respected. It has been a longstanding tenet of social work and psychiatry that individuals should be "accepted as they are" and that they should be "allowed to make their plans in the way that seems best to them." Challenge has risen in a variety of quarters as to the validity of such a permissive and accepting approach. It is quite possible, though sometimes difficult, to accept the individual as a person, to understand the validity of his behavior for him, and still to recognize that his behavior is defeating to himself and to members of his family. While understanding and accepting the subcultural patterns more characteristic of the very poor, it should be quite appropriate to recognize that a number of these patterns tend to operate to the disadvantage of many of them. It would seem to be a wiser strategy to work cooperatively with the very poor to change some of their patterns, which is quite different from "imposing our values and goals on other people."

Specific Kinds of Strategies

Preschool enrichment programs have been well-publicized as an important strategy in helping poor children overcome the deprivations associated with low-income culture patterns and the poverty environment. This is a strategy that requires further testing, however, using a variety of methods and working with a variety of groups. Experimentation and research along these lines are being financed by various projects in the Welfare Administration, as well as by other Federal programs and private foundations. Among those in the Welfare Administration are the following:

1. *Experimental Short-Term Reading Readiness.* This study includes 100 mother-child pairs on AFDC and selected middle-class controls. The reading readiness nursery seeks to test whether verbal stimulation and clarification of sex role of the child will contribute to increasing reading skills. University of Chicago; Fred L. Strodtbeck, principal investigator.

2. *Study of Experiential and Environmental Stimulation of Lower-Class Preschool Children.* Three groups of 50 families are interviewed and observed: slum area, stable working class, middle-upper-class professional-managerial. Inferences are drawn from the data to conduct a preschool program to make up for the quality, variety, and quantity of experiences lacking in the homes studied. University of Chicago, Committee on Human Development; Robert Hess, principal investigator.

3. *Demonstration of a College Using Its Resources to Meet the Developing Needs of Culturally Deprived Preschool Children and Their Families.* College upperclassmen, for a stipend, will enrich the lives of children in a deprived community in a preschool and after-school program. No evaluation is planned. Shaw University, North Carolina; Nelson Harris, principal investigator.

4. *Research and Demonstration Preschool Program for Deprived Children and Their Parents in an Urban Area.* Thirty children and their parents will be worked with for a three-year period in a program of nursery school plus counseling and education with parents. Howard University; Dr. Flemmie Kittrel, principal investigator. Evaluation aspects: Children's Bureau, Research Division.

5. *Enrichment of Rural, Economically Disadvantaged Preschool Children Through a Day-Care and Family Casework Program.* A demonstration project in Buckhorn, Kentucky designed to test whether or not a day-care program with nursery school content, supplemented by family casework services, can bring about positive changes in the measured intelligence and developmental levels of preschool children

from economically and socially disadvantaged families. Attempts will also be made to measure changes in family functioning. Project carried out as a constituent part of the Kentucky Department of Child Welfare.

6. *Development and Evaluation of a Demonstration Day-Care Center for Young Children Between the Approximate Ages of Six Months and Three Years.* The majority of children in this Center come from low-income families in which the mother is employed. This project, focusing on *early* enrichment, seeks to test this basic hypothesis: An appropriate environment can be created which can offset any developmental detriments associated with maternal separation and possibly add a degree of environmental enrichment frequently not available in families of limited social, economic, and cultural resources. Upstate Medical Center, State University of New York, Syracuse, N.Y.; Dr. Julius Richmond and Dr. Bettye Caldwell, principal investigators.

7. *Utilizing Day-Care Services as an Integral Part of the Aid to Families With Dependent Children Program.* An experimental approach to self-sufficiency restoration among dependent families. Under the sponsorship of the Department of Social Welfare, Providence, Rhode Island.

The "Head Start Program," which started in the summer of 1965 as a Federal-local preschool program under the sponsorship of the Office of Economic Opportunity, constitutes a national effort in the direction of decreasing the cognitive deficits of lower-income, preschool children. Localities wishing to start such a program and meeting certain basic standards received 90 percent Federal reimbursement for their costs. A guide,[143] prepared for communities, has emphasized a multifaceted approach to the child's needs: his health, emotional-social development, intellectual enrichment, family relationships, and positive interpersonal experiences with a wide range of community personnel—including such authority figures as policemen, teachers, and health and welfare personnel.

Thousands of preschool children were involved in this program during the summer of 1965. Plans are underway for the evaluation of the impact of these projects on youngsters and their families. One of the anticipated outcomes is a wealth of information as to the physical, psychological, and social strengths and weaknesses of the preschool children of poverty. Professionals close to this program anticipate that these data will provide impressive arguments for the strengthening of services to very poor children and their families.

Expanded Services in the "Slum School"

There is a growing awareness of the need to enrich education for disadvantaged children within the public school system. A discussion of recent legislation relating to Federal aid to improve the quality of teaching and pupil personnel services for the children of poverty is beyond the scope of this report. The same is true of legislation concerned with integration in the public schools. Suffice it to comment that educational enrichment at the preschool level may be of little avail if it is not followed by appropriate educational programs in the regular school system.

Educational programs, per se, however, are likely to be inadequate if they are not supported by auxiliary services. Recent legislation provides funds to be administered by the Children's Bureau to greatly improve medical services to children in low-income areas. These services will be coordinated closely with school programs—although variations in this general plan will obtain in different States. It is clear that handicapped or ill children cannot take full advantage of educational opportunities unless medical care is readily available.

In general, schools that serve children from lower-lower-class families may need to develop a more intensive and extensive variety of child-care services that are *complementary* to what the child's parents are able to offer. Experiments with school breakfasts, as well as lunches, are underway in some quarters. The same is true for bathing, laundry, and clothing services at the school. After-school recreational and study programs are also in operation in some communities.

How far the school can and should go in providing a network of services to complement the resources of the child's own family is open to question. There are arguments for and against such an approach. However, the crucial needs of disadvantaged school youngsters, in the many aspects of their lives, cannot be overlooked. Virtually the entire future population is under the purview of the schools. To overlook these needs is likely to spell failure for the youngsters involved, for the present and the future; to refer the matter back to the parents may well overstrain the social, psychological, and economic resources of many of these parents; and to refer the child to other health and welfare agencies in the community may mean that he never reaches these resources. Perhaps, in effect, a small health, education, and welfare unit is needed within the school building itself. As in reference to other suggestions made in this chapter, experimentation with and evaluation of approaches of this kind are indicated.

Infant Enrichment

It is further anticipated that cogent arguments will be marshalled for such services to be made available more intensively and extensively for the infants of the very poor. Some professionals—obstetricians, pediatricians, psychologists, psychiatrists, neurologists, social workers, public health nurses, and others—are urging that the services must begin prenatally. Along these lines, the already existing Federal-State maternal and child health programs of the Children's Bureau have been greatly expanded and intensified during the past few years. Recent Federal legislation also provides for the strengthening of medical services to public assistance recipients and other low-income persons certified as being medically indigent. (A further discussion of these and other ongoing public health programs is beyond the scope of this paper.)

A recent development is a reconsideration of the needs of infants and the possibility that some of them from extremely depriving, impoverished homes might benefit from foster day care or specially designed institutional care. Under the sponsorship of the National Institute of Mental Health, a series of multi-professional workshops has been held during the past few years to re-examine research and clinical findings on the needs and growth of infants in relation to their families and other possible caretakers. A project is currently underway at Children's Hospital, Washington, D.C., under the direction of Dr. Reginald Lurie, to test the impact on otherwise homeless infants of a carefully designed, small institution providing highly individualized, personal care to babies.

Experiments in foster day care for infants from extremely impoverished, neglecting homes have also been launched. At the National Day Care Conference, sponsored by the Children's Bureau in 1965, professionals and volunteers explored a wide variety of strategies aimed at early intervention in the care of infants and children, as one approach to ameliorate, or prevent, the many deprivations that are likely to be the lot of the children of the very poor.

Stimulus toward reaching the child of poverty, at or before birth, has come from a variety of sources. One of the most striking reports comes from the South End Project in Boston, under the direction of Boston University's Department of Psychiatry. Dr. Eleanor Pavenstedt and other staff members there found, in a family-centered preschool program, that youngsters from severely disorganized, "hard-core, multi-problem families" were already so severely damaged by the age of three years that an intensive preschool program had very limited impact on their development.[22] According to reports, these youngsters had already absorbed the rigidity, despair, fear, and constriction frequently associated with the subcultural patterns of the very poor. Such families and their children are very likely to present an extreme of a continuum. Other children of the very poor are probably not so severely damaged. But evidence remains that intervention strategies, to have a maximum effect, should probably start with the child's infancy—or before his birth.

Another Federally financed project, under the direction of Dr. Bettye Caldwell, Upstate Medical School, State University of New

York, seeks to enrich the experiences of infants in their own lower-lower-class homes.[26] By working with both mothers and babies, Dr. Caldwell is trying to discover whether planned enrichment experiences for infants can make a difference in their development and whether their mothers can change their attitudes and practices in appropriate directions.

Infant Enrichment: Within the Family or in Other Settings?

Insofar as possible, it would seem to be important to work with the parents of infants in their own homes, in an effort to change the attitudes, values, and child-rearing practices of the very poor, rather than to remove these infants to institutional or foster care. The concept of the family as a basic social unit of society is not to be tossed aside lightly. While some are questioning the "sacred nature" of the nuclear family and its viability in a complex, highly technical, urban society, it seems premature to place infants and young children in facilities away from home unless there is no possibility of strengthening the family unit enough so that the child can grow up with the continuing sense of belonging to his own parent or parents.

For too long, however, there has been a rigid, strict adherence in some quarters to the concept that an infant or child must be in the permanent, continuing care of his own mother or of a carefully selected parent substitute. Bowlby's earlier work[144] impressed this basic policy on many professionals in the child-care field. His later reconsideration of his previously firm convictions[145] has failed to gain general understanding and acceptance in some quarters. On the other hand, others have extended this reconsideration to broader fields of questioning. Impressed by child-care models from the Soviet Union, Israel, and Sweden, question is being raised by some specialists as to whether we might not, in this country, provide more care for infants and children outside their own homes. However, there is conflicting evidence for and against such programs, especially in the case of infants and especially in the case of all-day or total care in settings other than their own homes.[146]

Small, experimental projects along these lines are going forward here, as already indicated. Their effects are being evaluated. A cautious approach of this sort is certainly wise. As projects of this type are studied, more guides should develop as to what kinds of infants and children from what kinds of families will profit most from what kinds of care: within their own homes, partly within their own homes and partly within other settings, and completely removed from their own homes.

Related to the last alternative, we have the evidence presented by Leontine Young[147] in her recent study of two groups of children: (a) severely mistreated and (b) seriously neglected. She pleads that careful, realistic studies should be made of the family situations of these children and, when indicated, youngsters should be removed from homes in which extreme cruelty or extreme neglect exists and in which parents are unable to change their behavior. Severely neglecting parents, as she describes them, have characteristics that are similar, *in an extreme form,* to the characteristics found to be differentially associated with the subcultures of poverty. In Dr. Young's experience, severely neglecting parents are often relieved, with adequate casework help, to give up their children to other child-care agents, since these parents lack the multifaceted resources to act responsibly toward their young.

Although it is quite possible that some children of the very poor have very little chance for adequate development unless they are removed from their parents for full-time or most-of-the-time custody in a more growth-conducive setting, it seems that there is a danger in putting too much emphasis on the "save-the-children-of-poverty" theme.

Because children have more appeal to the public—and to many professionals; because their growth and change potential is higher than that of adults; because children can be planned *for,* rather than *with,* and this can be more gratifying to professional and nonprofessional change-agents—because of all these things, there has been more devotion in the past, and in the present, to the cause of high quality welfare programs for the very young.

Yet professionals in the service and human sciences fields also recognize the importance of the family as a crucial, dynamic, interacting force in all aspects of human behavior. There has been recognition for many years that a child's problems are in intimate interaction with those of his siblings and parents.[148] More recently, the extended kinship network has been rediscovered[149] as a still potent force in American society. This network is particularly potent for lower-class families. The full potentials of this kinship system are worthy of careful exploration before the child is plucked from a dynamic interaction network. This comment is made in reference both to the welfare of the child and to his own family. Thought must be given not only to the rejection and insecurity that a child may feel when removed from his siblings and parents but also to the insecurity and rejection that these relatives may feel, if they are adjudged to be inadequate in their familial roles.

Enrichment for Parents

More attention should be paid to the *families* of poverty, not to the children of poverty alone. It seems inappropriate and premature to assume that parents are incapable of further growth and change. (See also Chapter V, p. 51.)

Among the intervention strategies that might be tried more extensively for very poor parents is that of parent education—broadly defined. A group approach to working with very poor parents may be highly effective—at least in the case of some parents. This approach seems promising, partly because cultural change appears to be brought about (in part) through acceptance and identification with an individual who serves as an "ego ideal," especially if this person is the leader of a group, and most especially if this person is liked and admired by group members. As new patterns emerge through group activities, it is important that these patterns be rewarded. It is also important that these patterns be found by group members to provide a better coping mechanism for reality situations than previous patterns were. As the group leader serves as an ego ideal and as patterns are gradually absorbed by the group, they may also be gradually reinforced through group action.

Group programs are not visualized as the only way of helping the very poor, but they are suggested as a potentially important way. To be more specific, it has been found, by some, that clubs for AFDC mothers can have a strong appeal and seem to have good results.[150] The loneliness and social isolation of these mothers have been well documented. Emphasis is placed here on mothers, since it appears that it is extremely difficult to reach fathers and engage them in group activities. Even though this is difficult, it remains as an important task.[150,151]

In group activities for adults, it would seem important to bear in mind some of the more theoretical material presented above. If it is indeed vital to alleviate the anxiety associated with frustration and failure, then group programs should focus on providing a minimum of frustrations and maximum opportunities for quick success. Since the life style of such individuals is largely pragmatic and oriented toward doing rather than talking, these experiences might well be around immediate, concrete reality problems, such as difficulties in clothing and feeding the family, procuring health services, and so on.

Since many of the very poor tend not to be goal- or time-oriented, at least in the middle-class way, programs might generally be planned around immediate objectives. Planning probably should be flexible in terms of the scheduling of activities. For example, some leaders who work successfully with the very poor say that they keep a kind of open house which is available to mothers and fathers as they feel ready to use it. A more definite structuring of time may be planned at a later point, after new ways of life take on more meaning to group members.

It appears that very poor parents often need a great deal of nurturing themselves.[147] Most of them have been so deprived in their growing-up experiences that they are limited in their ability to meet the demands of parenthood. The well-worn concept that, in order to be a good parent one must have been well parented himself, has application here. A supporting, nonfrustrating experience in a small group may make up for some of the earlier deprivations of group members.

A reaching-out approach is indicated if one expects to involve many of the very poor in agency programs. Their tendency to distrust all that is middle-class, their sense of being rejected, their fear of the unfamiliar, all tend to keep them from making use of the services that are planned in their behalf. The person-to-person style that is warmly accepting and encouraging has generally far more meaning than a more rational approach to the effect that such and such a program will be helpful in certain ways.[150]

Fear of broader experiences and larger worlds also suggests that programs be established in the neighborhoods of the very poor.[152] Along this line, agencies probably would be well advised to take into consideration that some of them have a tendency to provide a middle-class setting. It is likely that decor more in keeping with what is familiar to low-income families would help to make an agency seem less foreign to them. On the other hand, many public welfare agencies seem to go too far in the opposite direction. Housed in old buildings, lacking in privacy, filled with long waiting lines, lacking any kind of ornamentation, some appear to be calculated to reinforce the sense of failure. Severe budget limitations on public welfare agencies are probably chiefly responsible for this, but conviction on the part of those who work with the poor might be able to bring about some changes. (Such changes have been made in some communities.)

In working with lower-lower-class adults, it would seem important to find ways of enlarging their horizons. A constricted, fearful life style is frequently communicated to the children. This is apt to be deleterious for both parents and children, since it tends to encapsulate them in the low-income areas and in the subcultures of poverty. A good deal has been done in reference to providing "higher horizons" for children and youth. It is suggested that more thought be given to the same concept in relation to parents. These broad experiences would more appropriately be planned in reference to what has value to parents themselves. There has been a tendency, when such programs are planned for adults—and they rarely are—to think in terms of providing experiences that are interpretive of programs that have been devised for their children. As previously mentioned, most of these parents have had very little in their lives that was planned specifically for their own benefit as individuals. Appropriate adult experiences might include a shopping expedition to department stores, a trip to a supermarket outside the immediate neighborhood, a picnic in a nearby park, an excursion to an adult movie, and so on. As parents find that they can move into the larger community and that the larger community has rewards for them as well as for their children, they would seem to be more likely to integrate this broader participation into the life of the family, since these experiences have had positive meaning for them as individuals. As participation acquires such meaning, parents may be more apt to enlarge their children's lives spontaneously, without being specifically indoctrinated to do so. And spontaneous parenting is more likely to have a deep and lasting effect on both parents and children.

Opportunities for Basic Education for Adults

The same might be said for changing parental attitudes toward education. Meaningful activities that have an educational component with immediate practical outcomes for parents themselves would seem to be more likely to promote positive attitudes toward education than a mere trip to the children's school. Programs such as learning how to read recipes which use surplus foods, learning how to read sewing or furniture refinishing instructions and using them, learning how to plan the family income and outgo, reading maps of the city, and so on, would probably provide rewards in educational fields that demonstrate to parents that learning is for them, as well as for their youngsters.

Literacy training, in general, should be made available to very poor parents to a far greater extent than is currently the case. Roughly one-tenth of our adult population has less than a 6th grade education. Twice that many have failed to finish the 8th grade. Most of these adults are estimated to be illiterate or semi-literate. The unemployment rate for totally illiterate adults in cities is about 50 percent, contrasted to around 5 percent for the total labor force population.[153]

The costs of such illiteracy or semi-literacy are paid within the family, as well as in the world of work. Children of severely undereducated parents tend to lack the role model and general home support that they need for academic achievement. Parents who read poorly or not at all suffer in a variety of ways as mothers and fathers. Many cannot leave their immediate neighborhoods to make use of wider community facilities because they cannot read street signs. Part of their failure to care for their children in appropriate ways stems from inability to read such material as instructions on medications, etc. They cannot read notices from school nor sign their names to applications, permission slips, and the like. They and their children are apt to be acutely handicapped and embarrassed by educational deficits such as these.

Although over $32 billion a year is currently being spent on public education in this country, less than one percent of this amount goes into adult basic education.[153]

Here, again, the great emphasis is on children and youth. While their education is of crucial importance, it is also important to extend the opportunity for basic education of a high quality to adults who have this need. A number of the points made regarding parent education, in general, might well be applied here. As in other modes of intervention strategy, an experimental approach with built-in evaluation models is indicated.

Deficits in verbal communication within the family might be reduced through a number of approaches to parents. It has been recommended that social workers, for example, give careful attention to how carefully and seriously they listen to what very low-income parents have to say.[147,152] Being listened to and understood can bring rewards to such persons and can help them feel that their efforts to communicate are well worth the effort. Generally, most very poor parents have been found not to come regularly to a discussion group, since verbal communication alone is not generally seen as a value. Activity groups, such as cooking and sewing classes, however, usually blossom into discussion groups, as parents feel more at ease and as their conversation is rewarded. As parents have the opportunity to talk with their peers and to enjoy communication, it is quite likely that communication with their children will improve spontaneously.[150] Of course, leaders might also point out that talking in the family, as one does in the group, might be a good idea. Again, it is quite possible that verbal communication within the family could improve more through such indirect methods than through direct instructions.

Day-Care Services: A Service for the Whole Family

Day-care services are currently conceptualized as being somewhat different from preschool programs. The latter are generally planned primarily for children between the ages of three and five who are—or are likely to be—disadvantaged in their cognitive, physical, and social-emotional development. Day-care services in the form of group care or foster day care are seen as services to children and parents, primarily in terms of providing daytime substitute care for youngsters of a variety of ages, from infancy (generally, in individual foster day-care homes) through early adolescence. These services are seen as being needed for children whose mothers are employed or who, for one reason or another (such as physical or emotional illness), cannot provide adequate full-time care for their children at home.

At the present time, there is considerable discussion over how much and what kind of day care should be provided and whether it should be conceptualized as a different undertaking from that of preschool programs.[154]

A few issues seem clear. If low-income mothers (especially those who are heads of families) are to go to work, it is imperative that high quality free or extremely low-cost day care be available for their school-age children, outside of school hours, as well as for their younger children. Moreover, partly because most day-care centers attempt in one way or another to change the subcultural and other behavioral patterns of many of their young charges, it is likely to be important for staff members of these centers to work in partnership with the parents. Group and individual approaches to parents seem necessary.

It has already been suggested—and associated experiments are underway—that trained nonprofessionals might be effectively employed in such settings.[143] This might include adolescent boys and girls from various social strata and competent parents in low-income neighborhoods. One reason that a variety of child-care strategies may be helpful is that they could provide a variety of role models for the younger children. If adolescents from various socioeconomic groups work together, social and cognitive distances between them may be reduced. Using parents in the neighborhood as employees in day-care centers may provide further employment outlets for them.

Skilled training and supervision are important for these aides. Day-care centers offer a potential for improved adaptation of low-income children and their parents to the demands of the dominant culture. They also offer a potential for diagnosis and correction of health defects, educational problems, and emotional disabilities.[154]

Especially since children from very poor families are particularly apt to have suffered from a host of deleterious environmental and familial experiences, low quality day-care arrangements could reinforce the problems that many already have. Such arrangements would surely fail to make constructive use of the opportunity they potentially offer to provide an environment that might be a significant factor in reducing generation-to-generation poverty.

If day-care centers are seen as being mainly custodial in nature, if staff are used only as "keep the children out of trouble" agents, then the maladaptive, subcultural child-rearing patterns more characteristic of the very poor will probably be further solidified.

High quality day-care centers are expensive. The Children's Bureau estimates that they cost an average of $1,000 per child per year for all-day care of one child.[143] It is more than likely that poor day-care facilities—or none—would cost society and the individual far more than this, over an individual's lifetime. Exactly what the gains and losses would be in this regard, however, is yet to be determined by careful cost accounting and long-range evaluation.

Homemaker Services

Visiting homemakers could be used more extensively and intensively than is generally the case at present. Many communities have no service of this kind, or quite limited services. These homemakers are visualized as being useful not only in times of crisis, such as during the illness of mothers, but as role models and teachers for parents. New ways in homemaking and child rearing may be imparted with particular effectiveness by a competent homemaker. As in the case of day-care centers, neighborhood women with applicable skills and personal qualities might be selected, trained, and supervised for work of this sort. Again, as in the case of the centers, low quality homemaking service is apt to be ineffectual and dangerous.[155,156]

Visiting homemakers do not necessarily have to work full-time or every day in one family, however. In Philadelphia,[151] for example, visiting homemakers (home teachers) work out of the Board of Education, Division of Home Economics, and visit families for only an hour or so each day or every few days.

It has been suggested that visiting homemakers might render an especially crucial service in families in which there is a newborn baby. Helping the infant get an excellent start in the family setting could be of significant assistance to him and his parents.

Guidance in Impulse-Control for Parents

Accepting, nurturant approaches to many of the very poor have been stressed. This does not mean, however, that a totally permissive style is indicated. It is impressive that research evidence has strongly suggested that firm, mild, consistent discipline is closely associated with many areas of success in life functioning. Characteristics more typical of the subcultures of the very poor seem to imply not only a depressed life style but, by middle-class standards, a very immature one. Such characteristics as magical thinking, subjective judgment, impulse gratification, use of force rather than reason, alienation from authority figures, lack of goal commitment, distrust of heterosexual relationships, projection of problems on to others, and other similar characteristics might be termed immature, at least in middle-class value terms. Emotional growth toward maturity rests not only on nurturance and the meeting of needs but also on guidance toward impulse control. Those who work with very poor adults probably should provide kindly, firm· consistent guidance in self-control and more effective reality coping for many of them.

This comment about guidance is derived from clues from a variety of sources. These sources indicate that a direct, assertive, specific approach appears to be more effective with disadvantaged adults than the more subtle, abstract, insight-oriented method often used with middle-class clients.[147,157]

Structured Learning

Role-playing and learning-by-doing projects also seem to be useful.[158,159] Considerable experimentation is going on at present along these lines. For example, instead of relying on internal personality changes developed from verbalized insights and a therapeutic relationship, the external environment is specifically structured, and individuals are taught to play certain roles in this environment. By acting differently in a structured situation, it appears that some people, at least, begin to feel and think differently. Specific instruction as to appropriate behavior may facilitate this.

Somewhat along this line, recent efforts in the field of family therapy may be adapted to highly disadvantaged families. Specific help in family communication, family problem solving, and role-playing within the family has shown promise in a variety of settings.[159,160,161,162]

Some Applications of Learning Theory

To some extent, *learning theory and its associated findings have been applied to changing the behaviors of the very poor.* There are a number of ways in which this theory and findings might be further applied. In general (but not always), rewarded behavior is more apt to persist than behavior that is punished. The type of reward makes a difference. In attempting to change child-rearing practices of the very poor, for instance, it seems as if further attention might be paid to the planned use of concrete, behavior-related, valued rewards. For example, a low-income mother who manages to get her children to school clean and on time for a month might be given a certificate of recognition, plus a monetary reward. The latter might be rationalized as recognition that clean, well-fed, rested children cost the mother money as well as effort. Parenthood, in general, tends to be expensive, and its rewards are often abstract and long in coming. Middle-class parents, with a wide range of other rewards in status, range of activities, income, etc., do not need rewards for good parenting in the same way that the lower-lower-class parent does—especially the mother who lacks a husband and faces the job of parenting alone.

Community Action

Other systems of planning learning experiences, reinforced by specific, meaningful rewards, might include various strategies in socialization experiences. These might cover a wide range—from learning how to give a party to participation in social action groups. Organized social action, using indigenous leaders, is being experimented with in many parts of the country.[163,165] This is, of course, one of the features of the delinquency prevention programs and the Economic Opportunity Act. Based on the concept of showing the poor how to help themselves, involving them constructively in their own welfare, giving them the feeling that they are participating in the larger life of the community, and providing them with a greater sense of status, such programs have great promise for demonstrating to the very poor that active coping with life is possible for them.

It seems likely that programs of this sort will have differential impacts on different individuals. As already mentioned, it is unrealistic to believe that any one approach will help all of those who are in need. Social action programs might have an especial appeal and usefulness for men, since lower-class men tend to have a strong need for leadership status and an outlet for aggressive drives. One reason for this comment is that male and female roles are regarded in more traditional terms in lower-lower-class culture. Another is that males on this socioeconomic level are generally deprived of status-giving roles in their employment. Because of their low status in their current lives and because of their earlier probable frustrations and rejections at home and in school, it seems to be crucially important to develop strategies that will provide opportunities for the lower-class male to acquire a sense of significance and active participation in a meaningful, socially acceptable role.

Opportunities for social action and community leadership also have a particular appeal and usefulness for young people, who have strong drives for peer group activity and a sense of significance as young adults.

Other opportunities are being developed for members of low-income groups to participate in the solution of problems associated with poverty. These opportunities include training for work as case-aides, homemakers, teacher's aides, etc.[164,165] The so-called indigenous nonprofessional, who shows capacity for such work, may be able to make an important contribution in communicating and planning with the very poor. Under supervision, such a connective person is likely to have powers of communication and problem-understanding in a different perspective from that of the middle-class professional. For example, there is considerable apparent success in using such personnel as counselors in neighborhood community mental health centers.[167] It has also been observed that, as the indigenous nonprofessional takes on the status and role of the helper, he may tend to solve some of his own problems.[166] (See also sections on *Day Care* and *Homemaker Services.*)

Family Life Education

Continuing problems of broken families among the very poor suggest a number of relevant strategies. One of these is experimentation in providing family life education and counseling programs for low-income boys and girls. Realistic programs of this sort, adapted to the situations and subcultures of the very poor, seem called for, since lower-lower-class cultural characteristics frequently include attitudes of hostility and distrust between the sexes, problems in communication, lack of knowledge about reproduction and male and female anatomy, and a sense that men and women belong to two different worlds. The usual family life education and counseling approach, however, is quite middle-class.[168] Assumptions are generally made as to values, attitudes, and resources that are closely associated with the middle-class situation, style, and vocabulary. In order for such programs to have meaning for very poor adolescents, new methods and materials need to be developed. At least one settlement house has experimented with a couples' club for very poor, newly married, young people. The program includes organized sports for the boys, homemaking classes for the girls, a nursery for babies, and a gradual introduction of social activities and discussion groups for young husbands and wives together.

A coeducational recreation, guidance, and work program for younger boys and girls might be developed. One objective could well be guidance toward the deferment of impulsive early marriages. It was found in one high school program that, when individual counseling was included for the parents and their youngsters, along with a family life education program for students, there was more success in reducing high school age marriages than when family life education was the only approach. One of the reasons for this higher rate of success was probably that a number of young people drift into early marriage at least partly because of difficulties in their home situation.

Family planning centers are developing in a number of localities when the communities are ready to accept them. A variety of methods in planning is offered, in keeping with the religious values of the clinic patients. There is growing recognition that free clinics of this kind must be made available to the very poor. A number of studies indicate that a sense of helplessness in coping with fate tends to be characteristic of the relationships between the sexes in lower-lower-class groups. Ability to limit family size could be an important ingredient in reducing such fatalistic negative attitudes and promoting marital stability.[169-171] New developments in contraceptive techniques offer hope for more ready and effective use of family planning devices for all socioeconomic groups. This may be especially true of lower-lower-class members who have tended to shun more complex methods in the past.[172] (As of March, 1966, the availability of Federal aid to family planning programs and research was markedly increased, as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare moved toward stronger, more direct support of local, State, and Federal activities associated with population dynamics.)

The high rate of unemployment among lower-lower-class males, especially nonwhite males, is also a serious threat to marital stability. Under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, provision is made for *job training for the very poor*. With the increasing disappearance of unskilled jobs, plus the complexity of urban life, family breakdown in this group will probably continue to rise, unless employment opportunities can be increased for the men. The extremely large youth population makes this even more imperative, especially with the launching of many young families in which the father cannot obtain work. It is recognized that job training is only part of the story here. However, a discussion of more basic changes in the economic structure and further implementation of fair employment practices in reference to minority groups is beyond the scope of this paper. (See also Chapter III.)

Experimentation is indicated in the development of films, simple booklets, charts, and other educational materials for the very poor. Such materials need to be realistic in reference to the poverty situation and subcultures; also, they should be written at an appropriate reading level. Appropriate films might be distributed through television, as well as for use in groups. A host of family life education and mental health films are on the market at present, but they are almost universally put in middle-class terms.[168] The same is true of publications on child care, homemaking, and so on. As literacy classes for adults spread, there would seem to be a pressing need for materials of this sort which would have special meaning for adults who are learning to read. Pilot efforts might well be launched, with careful evaluation as to their impact. Evidence available so far indicates that printed matter seems to be most effective in conjunction with person-to-person contact.

Improved Protective and Allied Services

Since much of the life style more characteristic of the very poor revolves around an orientation toward "keeping out of trouble" and a defensive self-protection, *more effective protective services are indicated* for disadvantaged neighborhoods. There is ample documentation as to the special difficulties encountered by the poor in obtaining community services, such as police protection, street cleaning, enforcement of housing laws, and garbage and trash removal. A more optimistic, expansive life style is not possible in the face of such immediate physical dangers. Current experiments in expanding legal aid to the poor offer considerable hope for improvement in these areas, as well as in others.[173]

The Public Housing Project and Some of Its Potentials for Planned Intervention

Since public housing projects tend to be inhabited in most communities by all, or nearly all, very poor people, they tend to intensify subcultures of poverty. Some seem so encapsulated as almost to become worlds of their own, containing within their many-storied walls a concentration of the disadvantaged.[174] Because of income regulations in many such projects, families that are able to pull themselves out of poverty also escalate themselves out of the housing projects. A kind of socioeconomic whirlpool semes to be at work, leaving within such projects individuals and families who can find no escape from failure. The old, the ill, the chronically unemployed, the female-headed family, large families with many little children are those who are generally left behind. In a sense, some housing projects, originally planned to provide a poverty-escaping environment, tend to take on some of the characteristics of the old-fashioned almshouse, in that they house a concentration of those who suffer from a variety of handicaps.

This can set up a milieu for further handicapping conditions. Not only may subcultures be reinforced, but a type of group contagion can set in, so that the social, psychological, and physical problems of individuals tend to impose their disorganizing effects on others in close contact with them. This kind of group contagion is observed to occur especially under such highly frustrating and anxiety producing conditions as those of poverty and prejudice.

Generally speaking, public housing projects have been lacking in the appropriations and enabling legislation which would make it possible for their administrators to set up a network of therapeutic services within the projects themselves. Rather, some have been allotted space (often inadequate) for clinics and social agencies (for example) but have been required somehow to persuade these organizations to make themselves available within the project.[174] These organizations, generally overburdened with other community demands, have tended to shy away from involving themselves directly in a service that is clearly an exceptionally demanding one.

If money and enabling legislation were available, experiments in massive intervention and imaginative structuring could be carried out in housing projects. Some European countries have experimented with therapeutic communities for highly disorganized, poor families. These communities are generally set off from the rest of society. A housing project, however, might be visualized as being something like the open mental hospital—a treatment center with easy access to and from the surrounding community.

Not only might the requisite health, education, and welfare services be established within a housing project, but careful planning might be done as to the distribution of project residents. For instance, a strong, well-organized family might be housed in an apartment between two weaker ones. Rent subsidies or wages might be given to the strong family, with the understanding that it would give specific assistance to the less adequate ones. Specific aid might consist of a variety of services, including teaching of better ways in home management and child rearing.

Stable working-class families might be planfully retained—or recruited—as project residents and paid to provide services for less stable, very poor families. Of course, they might also be valuable role models.

The possibilities of a planned environment within a housing project are far more extensive than those sketched here. It is recognized, also, that the difficulties are enormous. The payoff might be excellent.

This same general strategy has been suggested for the therapeutic neighborhood. Further details related to these suggestions will be left to others for elaboration.

Adaptation of Casework Practice

Much of what has been said in the earlier pages applies to casework practice with the very poor. Applicable points will have been obvious to the casework practitioner. More specific suggestions follow. The writer is particularly indebted here to the work of such specialists in this field as Janet Weinandy,[157] Leontine Young,[147] and Berta Fantl.[175]

All of these highly experienced specialists note that a direct, specific, assertive approach is generaly called for in working with the very poor. According to Fantl, for instance, "Clear, forthright, and correct statements are ego-supportive. Mere passive listening on the part of the worker may be felt as hostility and may increase anxiety or 'acting-out' behavior. However, if the worker intervenes insensitively, the client is likely to withdraw."[175]

Dr. Leontine Young, in her recent book describing her study of neglected and abused children and their parents, offers comments along the same lines. The parents of the neglected children in Dr. Young's study appear to conform closely in their attitudes and practices to those more characteristic of very poor parents, as revealed by the research overview presented in the preceding chapters. Dr. Young, in conceptualizing good casework practice writes, in part:

> ". . . The casework approach would need to begin with the simplest necessities of family life. Probably everyday routine is the most sensible of these. Routine is the structuring of the necessary activities of daily life so that we know what to expect and when to expect it; it gives the security of the familiar and the strength of continuity. It is in itself a form of organization and hence doubly important for disorganized families . . . its most important aspect may be meals which are cooked, put on the table and eaten at certain specified times by the whole family . . .
>
> "Cleanliness is another everyday necessity for health as well as organization of family life. Again the specific details of when, how, and what to clean must be the concern of the caseworker if a routine is to

be established. A generalized admonition to clean up the house is likely to be futile. Clothing needs washing and care, and the children need to be clothed in the house as well as out, particularly in cold weather in drafty houses and apartments . . .

"The logical question, of course, is how can [standards] be imposed unless or until the parents want such help or can respond to such an imposed structure. There is the need in many of longing to be dependent upon someone who is able to see them as they are and still be concerned for them. Their need for dependence is so great that it can become a focal point for whatever strengths they do have. Like children they respond to strength which substitutes the reality judgment of maturity for the distorted perspectives of their immaturity, that shares the too heavy responsibilities that makes the everyday rules within which they can find some direction . . .

". . . a large ratio of these parents are children psychologically. Their dependence, their inability to carry continuing responsibility, their distorted judgment, their impulsive behavior, their lack of consistent inner controls, their extensive narcissism, are all characteristic of small children. For small children these are normal characteristics but for adults they are not. Casework has sometimes forgotten its own basic rule, 'accept people as they are,' and in its wish to change them into what they ought to be has minimized the reality of that childishness. The parents have interpreted this often as further rejection, and have responded with indifference or active hostility . . .

"The caseworker who insists upon treating a neglecting parent as an adult finds that he has no relationship with that parent. No amount of financial assistance or continuing contacts is likely to alter the hostility and indifference that grows up between them . . .

"The neglecting parents who were able to make a dependent relationship to a caseworker were those who also tried to live up to what the caseworker wanted them to do. They took better care of their children because the case worker took better care of them. Their dependence, frequently excessive at first, gradually became at least somewhat more controlled as they learned what they could do for themselves. Like children they wanted to please the person who was good to them and therefore they were willing to follow the standards of behavior set up by the caseworker. Contrary to the expectations of many caseworkers, they wanted to be told what to do so long as they were convinced the caseworker was concerned for them, and they resented the one who told them, 'Of course it is your decision.' They wanted borrowed strength, not freedom of choice —a freedom they lacked the strength to use. The only relationships between parents and caseworkers in the record of this study were of this kind . . .

". . . Clearly if one accepts dependence, then authority is inherent in the situation. In recent years, casework has tended to move away from the use of authority, probably in reaction to the days when it was often both punitive and prejudiced in nature. In so doing it lost sight of the distinction between personal and professional authority. Personal authority may be irresponsible, may be a reflection of personal biases, may even with good intent intrude upon that which is none of its business. Profes-

> sional authority, while subject to all the human weaknesses of those who implement it, is confined by the structure of its purpose, disciplined by its responsibility and accountability, directed by professional knowledge. In casework, it is authority used to protect those who are unable to protect themselves. To relinquish it can be only to cripple that power to protect.
>
> "Authority has too often been confused with punishment. The expectation of some caseworkers that parents could only resent their authority and thus oppose their efforts springs very probably from this confusion. Actually no one could survive in any society without authority . . .
>
> "With [disorganized, dependent] neglecting parents, the use of protective authority is usually a relief. It lifts the weight of responsibility from them, protects them against their own confusion as well as from the consequences that would ensue from the unchecked expression of their destructive impulses. It is often their first encounter with consistent strength. Punishment they have been familiar with a long time, but strength has too often been unknown. Even when they grow angry at the limits imposed by authority, they show obliquely, like children, that they are glad it is there . . ."[147]

Weinandy, Young, and Fantl are also unanimous in their agreement that casework with the very poor requires a mutual focus of worker and client on the immediate, concrete situation. The subcultural patterns frequently found in this group, plus the severity of presenting, specific problems, generally require such an approach. A tendency of the "hard-core, multiple-problem poor" to "swing" helplessly from crisis to crisis demands not only a focus on the immediate situation but also a firm competency on the part of the worker in joining with the client to resolve the presenting crisis and to take steps to prevent the next one. Again, to quote Fantl, "By successfully helping clients around immediate crisis situations, the following may be accomplished: (1) Some relief is experienced in his ability to control his behavior, and (2) There is a growing feeling of confidence in the worker because he understood the client's feeling of extreme anger, fear of losing control or isolation from others without becoming frightened, 'hopeless' and discouraged about the client or deserting him as others have done in the past."[175]

Weinandy points out that this kind of crisis- and desperation-sharing can bring an exhaustion and despair in social work staff. Professionals engaged in such work need replenishment of their own emotional reserves through frequent, mutually supporting staff meetings, opportunities for consultation, and backing from agency administrators.

These same three writers also emphasize the importance of working with the entire neighborhood: key neighborhood leaders and communicators and the network of relevant business establishments, churches, schools, protective services, and health and welfare agencies.

Fantl recommends a neighborhood-centered service that sounds much like the settlement house of earlier days—an updated settlement house, perhaps. She writes, "Family caseworkers will have to expand their horizons—if they are not doing so already—to collaborate more freely, more effectively, less preciously and confidentially with other agencies around so-called 'multiple problem families' and to develop techniques to further communication and understanding between various key figures and the clients . . . We deal not just with child-parent relationships: we also need to deal with the community perceptions of the clients . . .

"By its mere existence a service like ours (neighborhood-centered) . . . demonstrates to the neighborhood and other key figures (probation officers, police, nurses, etc.) that they are no longer alone to tackle problems which are overwhelming . . . ."

Adequate Income Support

It has been proposed by a number of social scientists and social workers that devices should be found to guarantee an adequate annual income to all persons in the country. While the variety of strategies proposed is too large a subject to discuss here, it is relevant to note that the kinds of intervention suggested in the foregoing pages are hardly likely to have much effect if parents have too little money to provide themselves and their children with the basic essentials of life. An experiment might be conducted in which a group of poor families is simply supplied with enough public assistance to live above the so-called poverty line. It might be found that a steady, adequate income is sufficient, for the majority of recipients, to give them a base for changing life styles of hopelessness, impulsivity, fatalism, alienation, and apathy to life styles more conducive to positive mental health, educational achievement, social acceptability, "moral" character, and family stability. Not only might such a steady income accomplish these results, it might be the most economical approach to the problem.

A variety of modifications of the above general proposal might be tried, such as adequate income, plus specialized services of various kinds; adequate income through earnings from a public works program; slightly inadequate income with "salary raises" for certain desired behaviors, such as adequate child care and housekeeping; etc.

While some argue that "adequate relief" will create greater dependency and others argue that dependency increases with inadequate or no relief, it appears that this issue is yet to be resolved through experimental programs that are submitted to objective evaluation.

The foreging has been a presentation of some of the services and programs that may be effective in implementing changes in the cultural patterns of the very poor. This has not been an all-inclusive presentation, by any means. Other programs, such as camping programs, tutorial services, and neighborhood counseling centers also come to mind.

All of the suggestions made here are made in an experimental spirit. All are viewed as being subject to tentative application and careful evaluation. Further development of this theme will be found in the following chapter.

CHAPTER TEN

Some Implications for Research

The Welfare Administration sponsors a variety of research programs focused on learning more about the conditions and causes of poverty and the effectiveness of a variety of treatment approaches. Some suggestions for further necessary research in reference to the child-rearing and family life styles of the very poor and other socioeconomic groups are presented below.

Basic Research (See also Chapter II)

It is clear that more precise and rigorous studies are required in order to obtain more exact information about the various ethnic, regional, racial, and religious subcultures of poverty, with careful differentiation between the chronically poor, the shorter-term poor, the economically dependent poor, and poor families that do not receive public assistance, and between these groups and working-class and lower-middle-class families. When such differentiations are being made, relevant demographic variables must be simultaneously considered. A refinement of techniques is called for, with:

1. Careful attention paid to random sampling from a defined population.

2. Adequate sample size and description of sample.

3. Development of testing and other data-gathering instruments, with due consideration given to their relevance to the research questions of the study, their reliability and validity, and their applicability to the nature of the population being studied.

4. Analysis of data through the use of appropriate statistical methods and careful interpretation of the findings, with due regard to the limitations imposed by the methods used and the nature of the

samples studied. For example, many of the commonly used statistical tools for analysis of differences and relationships between groups are applicable only when random samples from a defined population are being studied. Moreover, generalizations of the results of this statistical analysis are unwarranted except as they are made to analagous populations.

The size of the sample is not so crucial as its makeup, in terms of being randomly representative of a larger defined population, and its other specific characteristics related to the total design of the study and the specific statistical method employed.

While the above points are elementary to researchers, they are overlooked so frequently, at least in research interpretation, that a reminder seems in order here.

5. Careful attention to the kinds of basic questions that are asked. For example, as pointed out in earlier chapters, much research seems to focus on the weaknesses of the very poor; research questions may well be unduly influenced by the middle-class bias of investigators, as well as by other factors, such as current theories and concerns.

6. Precise interpretation of findings. Along with the points made under (4), above, regarding interpretation of research results, go other comments. For instance, much may be made of obtained, statistically significant differences and relationships, so that these differences and relationships appear to have practical significance and to apply to a whole group. Actually, a finding might apply to the *minority* of a group and mean that a small number of people in one group have a certain tested characteristic to a greater extent than an even smaller minority in another group. While this may have *statistical* significance, it may not have *practical* significance. (See also pp. 9, 10.)

Another, allied point: Studies are frequently carried out which select for their populations groups that are at an extreme, such as chronically poor, highly disorganized families, compared to middle-class, stable families. This maximizes the researcher's chance of obtaining statistically significant results, but there is then a tendency to apply the findings to populations that are more toward the middle of the distribution, rather than at the extremes.

7. More attention to analysis of *variations within groups* is necessary. This type of research involves investigating the differentiating characteristics and associated variables of selected subgroups of individuals within a larger group such as, for example, a sample of 17-year-old boys from very poor, nonwhite families in an urban, industrial community. Within this sample, subgroups can be identified: for instance, boys who are still in high school and those who have dropped out. To

refine this further, there would be subgroups of those boys in school who were doing adequate academic work and those who were not; among the drop-outs, some would be employed, some not; and so on.

Related to the above point is the caution that other characteristics *within a group* need to be taken into account and analyzed. For instance, insufficient attention is frequently given to *differences between males and females*—yet these differences are apt to be large and pervasive in a number of relevant areas such as educational achievement, attitudes, values, goals, personality characteristics, biological-constitutional factors, etc. There is a growing body of evidence that the child-rearing patterns and behaviors of fathers tend to have a differential impact from those of mothers and that this differential impact also interacts with differential responses from boys, compared to girls.

Furthermore, it is very likely that child-rearing and family life styles have a different impact on children at different stages of their development; also parental patterns change in as yet insufficiently studied ways in reference to their attitudes and behaviors toward children at these different stages.

8. This leads to the point that more *longitudinal research is needed* in reference to the impact of child-rearing and family life patterns on children, from birth to maturity.

9. Such studies—as well as more short-term ones—require *more explicit definitions of the behavior studied,* the ways in which this behavior is measured, and the situation and location in which the behavior occurs. For example, aggressive behavior may be the independent variable under consideration. What, specifically, constitutes aggression? How is aggression measured—by observation, projective testing, paper and pencil testing, reports by others? When and where does aggression occur? How often? What other behaviors occur?

10. What attitudes and feelings accompany the behavior that is being studied? For instance, a mother may spank her child, with a wide variety of accompanying feeling tones and attitudes. There is also a wide variety of ways in which she might behave at other times—and this would, presumably, make a difference to the child's perceptions and reactions.

11. Other variables would also make a difference, which leads to the point that more *multi-dimensional,* within-group research is needed, involving a variety of professional competencies. For instance, there is a growing body of evidence to the effect that individuals vary from birth in their "coping capacity," their learning styles, and their vulnerability to stress.[176,177] Biological-constitutional factors seem to play an important role in these variations. Thus, some children would probably survive the

deprivations of poverty and/or maladaptive child-rearing patterns more readily than others.

Then, too, not all of the very poor,[178] by any means, suffer from mental illness or serious emotional problems. What are the associated differences, if any, in the child-rearing and family life patterns experienced by those who might be diagnosed as emotionally healthy and those who are diagnosed as emotionally or mentally ill?

In reference to intellectual capacity, the results from a number of studies strongly suggest that this capacity is partly genetic in character. Brain damage at birth, or later, also may play a part, as may nutritional deficiencies. (See Chapter V on educational achievement.) Given the same general socially and economically depriving environment, children of the same age do not necessarily have equal rates and levels of intellectual development, nor do children from the same families have uniformly equal I.Q.'s. What are the differentials associated with these differing rates and levels?

In general, it is essential to learn more about cognitive development: to what extent the very early years are crucial, whether or not there are critical stages of learning, and whether or not strategies may be developed to enlarge the individual's learning potential after he has reached adulthood. (See also Chapter V.)

The same general principles of analysis of within-group variance apply to differing levels of social acceptability, educational achievement levels, "good moral character," and marital stability, *within* a defined poverty group. What are the child-rearing and family life style variables, if any, associated with different ratings for subgroups of individuals within the larger group? For example, what are the characteristics of the child-rearing and family life experiences of a subgroup of the very poor who maintain a stable, satisfying marriage compared to a subgroup who do not?

12. Also related to the subject of variance is the comment that more attention needs to be paid to problems in prediction from research findings when measures of variance are not readily available or when sufficient attention is not paid to subgroups that are highly deviant from the mean. The possibility that some groups (such as lower-lower-class ones) may have an especially high degree of within-group variation on certain traits (such as intelligence) also needs to be considered.

13. One more comment. More explicit studies are needed in which the child-rearing and family life styles of parents are investigated in terms of their impact on *their* children. There is a tendency to study parental attitudes, etc., in one research project and child behaviors in a different one, or to observe children carefully in a school setting, for instance, and interview parents at home. More careful observation is desirable, over time, and in different settings of parent-child interaction.

The points that have been made in the foregoing pages obviously have application to research in general in reference to the impact on children of child-rearing and family life styles. Most of these points apply just as much to studies of other socioeconomic groups as they do to the very poor. While the general tendency has been to study middle-class groups, and much more is known about them, much more remains to be learned.

Experimental Action Research

There is a strong need for action research aimed at finding out whether specific treatment and other programs actually "make a difference." While more basic research has its important place in yielding more sophisticated insights and in suggesting programs for change, a crucial question is whether these insights and suggestions add up to effective programs. Although more basic research has (by no means) yielded all or even most of the answers on which experimental programs might be based, it is impractical to wait for these answers before experimenting with a variety of intervention strategies. The question whether or not such strategies actually prove to be effective must be objectively tested, insofar as this is possible. At the same time that this experimentation and testing go on, we must remain alert to relevant emerging findings from more basic research. In fact, action researchers and basic researchers need to continue intercommunication, because each group can enrich the work of the other.

In the preceding chapter, suggestions were made for various ways of devising services for very poor families which might lead to more effective child-rearing practices and family life style. Programs designed along such lines should be subjected to carefully designed evaluation techniques. Part of this evaluation needs to be focused on behavioral outcomes that can be objectively measured.

Evaluation too frequently is focused only on attempts to measure such factors as changes in attitudes and information. A serious limitation to this approach is that there is no guarantee that changed attitudes and information lead to changed behavior.[179]

For instance, if, following a parent discussion group, parents say that harsh, physical, dictatorial punishment has a bad effect on children, does this mean that they actually refrain from this kind of punishment and substitute in its place mild, consistent, reasoned discipline? To push this point one step further, if parents do manage to behave differently in reference to discipline, does their children's behavior show an objectively observable difference? Theoretically, such a parental change should lead to a reduction in a child's overt aggression in the home, school, and community. Do such changes occur and are they maintained over time?

Long-range behavioral outcomes associated with service programs designed for the very poor may include such factors as improved school attendance and academic success, higher measured intelligence, obtaining and holding employment, better handling of family income, improved housekeeping, better physical health, reduction in deviant behavior, and increase in marital stability.

If goals such as these are reached, which individuals reach them and under what program methodologies and content? What else has been happening in the life situation and larger environment of the family? Do all family members change or just some of them? If only some of them change, what are their differentiating characteristics?

For which individuals does the program seem to be a failure? What are their characteristics? We can learn just as much from reported failures as we can from reported successes, although the tendency seems to be to publish reports only of the successes.[180]

Does the group served by a program change to a greater extent than a group not served? If behavioral changes are found to occur, do they persist over time? For whom do they persist and under what conditions?

Experimental programs with an evaluation component need to be repeated with different groups of subjects, with different staff composition, and in different parts of the country in order to find out whether or not the service methodology has general application or whether success or failure is related to specific characteristics of a particular agency, particular staff member, particular population group, particular community situation, and so forth.

It is important to try a variety of experimental approaches in order to find out whether there is actually a difference between them in reference to their impact. For example, it might be found that intensive casework, carried out by a highly trained social worker for a two-year period with a small caseload of very poor fathers and mothers, (apparently) resulted in improved management of the family income, fewer reported marital conflicts, and an increased employment rate for the father. There are a number of pertinent questions that could be raised about obtained results of this kind, such as the impact of the personal characteristics of the caseworker on the individuals served, the nature of the study sample, the criteria of improvement, and the length of time that such improvements persisted.

The main point here, however, is whether other services—such as group work, employment counseling, job training, increased public assistance grants, improved school situations for the children, better health services—or no planned service at all—might not result in the same, or even more favorable, outcomes.

A service may actually be proved to yield favorable results for a large number of people, yet question must be raised as to whether this is the *best* service that can be devised. Also, it is imperative to consider the cost of the service—what is the per capita dollar investment for what kinds of returns? Then, too, there is the possibility that no service at all might yield just as favorable results. Perhaps, for instance, a change in the tax structure or in the basic economy might (apparently) bring about these desired changes.

Experiments of different kinds with different age and sex groups are essential. If a service is effective, for *whom* is it effective? Is there a particularly strategic intervention point in the family life cycle that will yield changed human behavior, over time, not only for the individual concerned, but for the members of his family? Should services be maximally directed towards adolescents, newlyweds, parents of infants, the infants themselves, pre-adolescents—or even grandparents?

Do child-rearing and family life styles have an impact on whether a family member can obtain and hold employment? What kind of employment—for how long? There are almost no precise studies as to what factors are associated with employment success, especially below the professional and managerial level. Although national data reveal the impact of education, age, race, sex, marital status, and regional background in reference to employment, wages, and specific occupational fields, there appear to be no studies that explore the association between occupational performance and child-rearing and family life patterns. Those studies by Miller and Swanson[181] regarding entrepreneurial and bureaucratic families and their child-rearing patterns explore an allied but different aspect of this question. Their findings strongly suggest that much remains to be explored in the general area, not only in reference to child-rearing patterns but in reference to the style of relationships between the parents.

As strategies are developed to move young people and adults into employment, it would seem to be relevant to consider the total family pattern of the work candidate and its possible relationship to job failure or success. Conversely, the impact on the family of job training and placement requires evaluation. Perhaps services to families are of crucial importance to employment success, or perhaps employment success mitigates the demand for family services.

Questions like those above are being raised in reference to a wide variety of programs designed to help the very poor move into full participation in our generally prosperous society. Much experimentation is under way. There is a tendency in some quarters to discard all that which has been tried in favor of innovation. The fervor surrounding new approaches may, in some instances, make them seem more effective than they will actually prove to be over time. Their apparently superior effectiveness may be associated most closely with the fervor and rather minimally with the method. For instance, a wide range of experiments has shown that the climate of new approaches and action can provoke improved results but that these results are just as likely to occur for the "placebo" group as for the experimental group. Thus, old ways need to be carefully tested, as well as new ones.

Many of the points made above in reference to basic research apply to the evaluative testing process, such as spelling out specific goals, selection of a random sample from a defined population, specific definition of what is to be measured, careful attention to the reliability and validity of testing instruments, application of appropriate statistical tools, longitudinal design, within-group analyses, multi-dimensional considerations, and caution in the interpretation of results.

Many technical difficulties are present in evaluative research of this kind. Measurement of change is one of these difficulties. The Division of Research of the Welfare Administration is currently engaged in an attempt to devise a method of measuring family change that can be used by research personnel, as one evaluation method in a number of experimental projects.

Some very difficult research and evaluation questions have been raised here. Finding at least some of the answers will not only add to scientific knowledge and give clues to further research but will also contribute to the development of public welfare and related practices aimed at expanding the opportunities for individuals and families so that they can come closer to the development of their full human potentials.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

1. Cohen, Wilbur, and Eugenia Sullivan. "Poverty in the United States." *Indicators.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. February 1964. p. vii.

2. Lewis, Oscar. *Children of Sanchez.* New York: Random House. 1961.

3. Riessman, Frank. *The Culturally Deprived Child.* New York: Harper and Bros. 1962.

4. Myers, Jerome K., and Bertram H. Roberts. *Family and Class Dynamics in Mental Illness.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1959.

5. McKinley, Donald Gilbert. *Social Class and Family Life.* London: The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-McMillan, Ltd. 1964.

6. Glick, P.C., and H. Carter. "Marriage Patterns and Educational Level." *American Sociological Review.* 1958. 23, 294–300.

7. Handel, Gerald, and Lee Rainwater. "Working-Class People and Family Planning." *Social Work.* April 1961. 6, 2.

8. Burgess, Elaine, and Daniel Price. *An American Dependency Challenge.* Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1313 E. 60th Street. 1963.

9. Davis, A., and R. J. Havighurst. "Social Class and Color Differences in Child-Rearing." *American Sociological Review.* 1946. 11, 698–710.

10. Rodman, Hyman. "On Understanding Lower Class Behavior." *Social and Economic Studies.* December 1959. VIII, 441–450.

11. Monahan, Thomas P. "Premarital Pregnancy in the United States: A Critical Review and Some New Findings." *Eugenics Quarterly.* September 1960. VII, 133–147.

12. Dreger, Ralph Mason, and Kent S. Miller. "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites in the United States." *Psychological Bulletin.* September 1960. LVII, 361–402.

13. Vincent, Clark. *Unmarried Mothers.* New York: The Free Press of Glencoe. 1961.

14. Jones, Wyatt C., Henry J. Meyer, and Edward F. Borgatta. "Social and Psychological Factors in Status Decisions of Unmarried Mothers." *Marriage and Family Living.* August 1962. XXIV, 224–230.

15. Miller, Walter B. "Implications of Urban Lower-Class Culture For Social Work." *Social Science Review.* September 1959. XXXIII, 219–236.

16. Cloward, Richard A., and Lloyd Ohlin. *Delinquency and Opportunity.* Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1960.

17. Cohen, Albert K., and James F. Short, Jr. "Research in Delinquent Sub-Cultures." *Journal of Social Issues.* 1958. 14, 20–37.

18. Reiss, Albert J. "Are Educational Norms and Goals of Conforming, Truant, and Delinquent Adolescents Influenced by Group Position in American Society?" *Journal of Negro Education.* Summer 1959. 28, 309–333.

19. Komarovsky, Mirra. *Blue Collar Marriage.* New York: Random House. 1964.

20. Herzog, Elizabeth. "Some Assumptions About the Poor." *Social Service Review.* December 1963. XXXVII, 4.

21. McCabe, Alice, *et al.* "Forty Forgotten Families." New York: Community Service Society. 1965. (Mimeo)

22. Bandler, Louise. "A Comparison of the Child-Rearing Environment of Upper Lower-Class and Very Low Class Families." Boston: South End Family Program, Boston University. 1965. (Mimeo)

23. Burchinal, Lee, and Hilda Siff. "Rural Poverty." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* November 1964. 26, 4, 399–405.

24. Kaplan, Beaton H. "Lower Class Religious Groups." *The Journal of Social Issues.* January 1965. XXI, 1, 126–141.

25. Radin, Norma, and Paul H. Glasser. "The Use of Parental Attitude Questionnaires With Culturally Disadvantaged Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* August 1965. 27, 3, 373–382.

26. Caldwell, Bettye, and Julius Richmond. "Programmed Day Care For the Very Young Child: A Preliminary Report." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* November 1964. 26, 4, 481–488.

27. Witmer, Helen. "Children and Poverty." *Children.* November-December 1964. 11, 6, 207–213.

28. Kahn, Gerald, and Ellen J. Perkins. "Families Receiving AFDC: What Do They Have To Live On?" *Welfare in Review.* October 1964. 2, 10, 7–15.

29. U.S. Department of Labor. *1960 Handbook on Women Workers.* Women's Bureau Bulletin 275. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

30. Lajewski, Henry C. "Child Care Arrangements of Full-Time Working Mothers." Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1959.

31. Herzog, Elizabeth. "Children of Working Mothers." Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1960.

32. Sewell, William H., and Archie O. Haller. "Social Status and the Personality of the Child." *Sociometry.* June 1956. XIX, 114–125.

33. Kohn, Melvin, and Eleanor Carroll. "Social Class and Allocation of Parental Responsibility." *Sociometry.* December 1960. XXIII, 372–392.

34. Kantor, Mildred, John C. Glidewell, Ivan N. Mensh, Herbert Darnlee, and Margaret Gildea. "Socioeconomic Level and Maternal Attitudes Toward Parent-Child Relations." *Human Organization.* Winter 1958. XVI, 44–48.

35. Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Toward a Theoretical Analysis of Parent-Child Relationships in a Social Context." In *Parental Attitudes and Child Behavior.* John Glidewell, ed. Springfield Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Inc. 1961.

36. Littman, R. A., R. A. Moore, and J. Peerce-Jones. "Social Class Differences in Child-Rearing, A Third Community." *American Sociological Review.* 1957. 22, 694–704.

37. Cohen, Albert K., and Harold M. Hodges. "Characteristics of the Lower Blue Collar Class." *Social Problems.* 1963. 10, 4, 303–333.

38. Bach, George R. "Father-Fantasies and Father-Typing in Father-Separated Children." *Child Development.* March-June 1946. XVII.

39. Sears, Robert R., Margaret H. Pintler, and Pauline S. Sears. "Effect of Father Separation on Preschool Children's Doll Play Aggression." *Child Development.* December 1946. XVII, 219–243.

40. Whiting, John W.M. "Socialization Process and Personality." *Psychological Anthropology.* Francis L. K. Hsu, ed. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press. 1961. ch. XII.

41. Clausen, John A., and Judith R. Williams. "Sociological Correlates of Child Behavior." *Child Psychology.* Harold W. Stevenson, Jerome Kagan, and Charles Spiker, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1963. ch. II. pp. 26–107.

42. Rainwater, Lee. "Work Identity and the Lower Class Male." To be published in early 1966. (Mimeo)

43. Lewis, Hylan. "Child-Rearing Practices Among Low Income Families in the District of Columbia." Paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare in Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 16, 1961. Washington, D.C.: Health and Welfare Council of the National Capitol Area. 1961. (Mimeo)

44. Miller, S. M., and Frank Riessman. "The Working Class Subculture: A New View." *Social Problems.* Summer 1961. 9, 86–97.

45. Kohn, Melvin L. "Social Class and Parental Values." *American Journal of Sociology.* January 1959. 64, 337–351.

46. Caldwell, Bettye M. "The Effects of Infant Care." In *Review of Child Development.* Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, eds. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1964. V. 1.

47. Klatskin, E. H., "Shift in Child Care Practices Under an Infant Care Program of Flexible Methodology." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry.* 1952. 22, 52–61.

48. Maccoby, E.E., and P. K. Gibbs. "Methods of Child-Rearing in Two Social Classes." In *Readings in Child Development.* W. E. Martin and C. B. Stendler, eds. New York: Harcourt Brace. 1954. pp. 380–396.

49. White, M. S. "Social Class, Child-Rearing Practices, and Child Behavior." *American Sociological Review.* 1957. 22, 704–712.

50. Burchinal, Lee, Bruce Gardner, and Glen Hawkes. "Children's Personality Adjustment and Social-Economic Status in Their Families." *Journal of Genetic Psychology.* June 1958. XCII, 149–159.

51. Yarrow, Leon J. "Separation From Parents During Early Childhood." *Review of Child Development.* Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, eds. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1964. V. 1.

52. Mussen, Paul H., and Luther Distler. "Masculinity, Identity, and Father-Son-Relationships." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology.* November 1959. V. 59; and "Consequences of Masculine Sex Typing in Adolescent Boys." *Psychological Monographs.* No. 75. 1961.

53. Lvnn, David B., and William L. Saurey. "The Effects of Father Absence on Norwegian Boys and Girls." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* September 1959. 59, 258–262.

54. Stolz, L. M., *et al. Father Relations of War-Born Children.* Stanford California: Stanford University Press. 1954.

55. Sears, Robert, Eleanor Maccoby, and Harry Levin. *Patterns of Child-Rearing.* Evanston, Illinois, and White Plains, New York: Row, Peterson and Company. 1957.

56. Bayley, N., and E. S. Schaefer. 'Relationships Between Socioeconomic Variables and the Behavior of Mothers Toward Young Children." *Journal of Genetic Psychology.* 1960. 96, 61–77.

57. Wortis, H., *et al.* "Child-Rearing Practices in a Low Socioeconomic Group." *Pediatrics.* 1963. 32, 298–307.

58. Glidewell, Thomas, *et al. Parent Attitudes and Child Behavior.* Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Inc. 1961.

59. Roff, M. "A Factorial Study of the Fels Parent Behavior Scales." *Child Development.* 1949. 20, 29–45.

60. Baldwin, A. "Socialization of the Parent-Child Relationship." *Child Development.* 1948. 19, 127–136.

61. Antonosky, H. F. "A Contribution to Research in the Area of the Mother-Child Relationship." *Child Development.* 1959. 30, 37–51.

62. Block, J., V. Patterson, J. Block, and D. Jackson. "A Study of the Parents of Neurotic and Schizophrenic Children." *Psychiatry.* 1958. 21, 387–397.

63. Law, S. "The Mother of the Happy Child." *Smith College Studies in Social Work.* 1954. 25, 1–27.

64. Peterson, D. R., W. C. Becker, L. A. Hellmer, D. J. Shoemaker, and H. C. Quay. "Parental Attitudes and Child Adjustment." *Child Development.* 1959. 30, 119–130.

65. Watson, G. "Some Personality Differences in Children Related to Strict or Permissive Discipline." *Journal of Psychology.* 1957. 44, 227–249.

66. Radke, M. J. "The Relation of Parental Authority to Children's Behavior and Attitudes." University of Minnesota Child Welfare Monographs. No. 22. 1946.

67. Porter, B. M. "The Relationship Between Marital Adjustment and Parental Acceptance of Children." *Journal of Home Economics.* 1955. 57, 176–182.

68. Thompson, George. *Child Psychology.* Second Edition. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co. 1962. pp. 621–660.

69. Baldwin, A. L., J. Kalhorn, and F. H. Breese. "Patterns of Parent Behavior." *Psychological Monographs.* 1945. 48, 3.

70. *Report of the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

71. Beiser, Morton. "Poverty, Social Disintegration and Personality." *The Journal of Social Forces.* January 1965. XXI, 1.

72. McCord, Joan, William McCord, and Emily Thurber. "Some Effects of Paternal Absence on Male Children." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* March 1962. LXVI, 361–369.

73. Russell, Ivan L. "Behavior Problems of Children From Broken and Intact Homes." *Journal of Educational Sociology.* November 1957. 31, 124–129.

74. Bell, Robert R. "The One-Parent Mother in the Negro Home." Philadelphia: Sociology Department, Temple University. (Mimeo)

75. Stolz, Lois M., "Effects of Maternal Employment on Children: Evidence From Research." *Child Development.* December 1960. XXXI, 749–782.

76. Bernstein, Basil. "Social Class and Linguistic Development, A Theory of Social Learning." In *Education, Economy and Society.* A. H. Halsey, Jean Flowd, and C. Arnold Anderson, eds. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe. 1961.

77. John, Vera P., and Leo S. Goldstein. "The Social Context of Language Acquisition." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly.* July 1964. 10, 3.

78. Walters, James, and Ruth Cannon. "Interaction of Mothers and Children From Lower-Class Families." *Child Development.* 1964. 35, 433–440.

79. Rosen, Bernard C. "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psycho-Cultural Dimension of Social Stratification." *American Sociological Review.* April 1956. XXI, 203–211.

80. Strodtbeck, Fred. "The Hidden Curriculum in the Middle-Class Home." Chicago: The Social-Psychology Laboratory, University of Chicago.

81. Hess, Robert. "Educability and Rehabilitation: The Future of the Working Class." *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* November 1964. 26, 421–429.

82. Hunt, J. McV. "The Psychological Basis For Using Pre-School Enrichment as an Antidote for Cultural Deprivation." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly.* July 1964. 10, 3, 209–243.

83. Bloom, Benjamin S. *Stability and Change in Human Characteristics.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1964.

84. Sontag, L., C. Baker, and V. Nelson. "Mental Growth and Personality Development, A Longitudinal Study." Monograph of the Society For Research in Child Development. No. 68. 1958.

85. Block, J. "Personality Characteristics Associated With Fathers' Attitudes Toward Child-Rearing." *Child Development*. 1961. XXXII, 261–270.

86. Bayley, Nancy, and Earl Schaefer. "Correlations of Maternal and Child Behavior With the Development of Mental Abilities." Society For Research in Child Development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Serial No. 97. 1964. 29, 6.

87. Veroff, J., F. Atkinson, S. Feld, and G. Gurin. "The Use of Thematic Apperception Tests to Assess Motivation in a Nation-wide Interview Study." Psychological Monographs. No. 499. 1960. LXXIV.

88. Crandall, W. J., Anne Preston, and Alice Robson. "Maternal Reactions and Development of Independence and Achievement Behavior in Young Children." *Child Development*. 1960. 31, 243–251.

89. Siegel, Irving E. "The Attainment of Concepts." In *Review of Child Development Research*. Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, eds. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1964. V. 1.

90. Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Socialization and Social Class Through Time and Space." In *Readings in Social Psychology*. E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley, eds. New York: Henry Holt & Sons. 1961.

91. Caldwell, Bettye, and Julius Richmond. "Social Class Level and the Stimulation Potential of the Home." Paper presented at the 1964 meetings of the American Psychological Association. Syracuse, New York: Department of Pediatrics, Upstate Medical Center, State University of New York. (Mimeo)

92. Hunt, J. McV. *Intelligence and Experience*. New York: Ronald Press. 1965.

93. Crandall, Vaughn J. "Achievement." *Child Psychology*. 62nd Yearbook For National Social-Study Education. Harold A. Stevenson, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 416–459.

94. Chance, June E., "Independence Training and First Grader's Achievement." *Journal of Consultant Psychology*. 1961. XXV, 149–154.

95. Whyte, W. F. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1955.

96. Barber, B. *Social Stratification: A Comparative Analysis of Structure and Process*. New York: Harcourt Brace. 1957.

97. Warner, W. L., and J. C. Abeggden. *Big Business Leaders in America*. New York: Harper and Bros. 1955; and *Ocupational Mobility in American Business and Industry*, 1928-1952. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1955.

98. Honzik, M.P., J. W. McFarlane, and L. Allen. "The Stability of Mental Test Performance Between Two and Eighteen Years." *Journal of Experimental Education*. 1948. 17, 309–324.

99. Tyler, Leona E. *The Psychology of Human Differences*. Third Edition. New York: Appleton-Century, Crofts, Inc.

100. Blatt, Burton. "Educating Intelligence: A Study in the Prevention of Mental Retardation." Boston: Special Education Department, Boston University. (Mimeo)

101. Kuhlen, Raymond G., and George Thompson. *Psychological Studies of Human Development*. Second Edition. New York: Appleton-Century, Crofts, Inc. 1962.

102. Hebb, D. O. *The Organization of Behavior*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1949.

103. Erickson, Erik H. *Childhood and Society*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. 1950.

104. Piaget, J. *The Moral Judgment of the Child*. New York: Harcourt Brace. 1932.

105. Gesell, Arnold. *The Embryology of Behavior*. New York: Harper and Bros. 1945.

106. Havighurst, R. J., "Culture and the I. Q." *Scholastic Review*. 1949. 57, 187–189.

107. Tyler, Leona E. *The Psychology of Human Differences*. Third Edition. New York: Appleton-Century, Crofts, Inc. 1965. p. 338 (Table by Harrell and Harrell)

108. Koch, H. L. "A Study of Some Factors Conditioning the Social Distance Between the Sexes." *Journal of Social Psychology*. 1944. 20, 79–107.

109. Lippitt, Rosemary. "Popularity Among Pre-School Children." *Child Development*. 1941. 12, 305–332.

110. Northway, M. L., and J. Detwiler. "Children's Perceptions of Friends and Non-Friends." *Sociometry*. 1956. 18, 527–531.

111. Bonney, M. E. "Relationships Between Social Success, Family Size, Socioeconomic Home Background and Intelligence Among School Children." *Sociometry*. 1944. 7, 26–39.

112. Elkins, D. "Some Factors Related to the Choice-Status of 90 Eighth Grade Children in a School Society." Genetic Psychology Monograph. 1958. 58, 207–272.

113. Davis, J. A. "Correlates of Sociometric Status Among Peers." *Journal of Educational Research*. 1957. 50, 561–570.

114. Laughlin, F. "The Peer Status of 6th and 7th Grade Children." New York: New York Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University. 1954.

115. Cameron, N. *The Psychology of Behavior Disorders*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1947.

116. Kohlberg, Lawrence. "Development of Moral Character and Moral Ideology." In *Review of Child Development Research*. Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman, eds. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1964. V. 1.

117. Hartshorne, H., and M. A. May. *Studies in the Nature of Character*. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1928–1930.

118. Peck, R. F., and R. J. Havighurst. *The Psychology of Character Development*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1960.

119. Kohlberg, L. "The Development of Children's Orientations Toward a Moral Order." *Vita Humana*. 1964.

120. Hoffman, L. M. "Early Processes in Moral Development." New York: Social Science Research Council, Conference on Character Development, 1963.

121. White, Ralph K., and Ronald O. Lippitt. *Autocracy and Democracy*. New York: Harper and Bros. 1960.

122. Bandura, A., and R. H. Walters. *Adolescent Aggression*. New York: Ronald Press. 1959.

123. Goode, W. J. *After Divorce*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1956.

124. Chilman, Catherine S., and Marvin B. Sussman. "Poverty in the United States in the Mid-Sixties." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. November 1964. V. 26.

125. Blood, R. O., and D. M. Wolfe. *Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1960.

126. Rainwater, L., and Karol K. Weinstein. *And the Poor Get Children*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books. 1960.

127. Rainwater, Lee. "Marital Sexuality in Four Cultures of Poverty." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1964. 26, 4.

128. Yancey, William L. "The Culture of Poverty: Not So Much Parsimony." St. Louis, Missouri: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Washington University. 1964. (Mimeo)

129. Cavan, Ruth Shonle. "Subcultural Variations and Upward Mobility." In *Handbook of Marriage and the Family.* Harold Christiansen, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally Co. 1964.

130. Kirkpatrick, Clifford. *The Family As Process and Institution.* New York: Ronald Press. 1963. pp. 375–407.

131. Burgess, Ernest W., and Leonard S. Cottrell. *Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. 1939. pp. 58–74.

132. Terman, L. M. *Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1938. pp. 48–83.

133. Locke, Harvey J. *Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: A Comparison of a Divorced and a Happily Married Group.* New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1951.

134. Stroup, Atlee L. "Predicting Marital Success or Failure in an Urban Population." *American Sociological Review.* 1953. 28, 560.

135. King, Charles E. "The Burgess-Cottrell Method of Measuring Marital Adjustment Applied to a Non-White Southern Urban Population." *Marriage and Family Living.* 1952. 14, 284.

136. Locke, Harvey J., and Karl M. Wallace. "Short Marital-Adjustment and Prediction Tests: Their Reliability and Validity." *Marriage and Family Living.* 1959. 21, 251–255.

137. Bowerman, Charles. "Adjustment in Marriage: Over-All and in Specific Areas." *Sociology and Social Research.* 1957. 41, 257–263.

138. Locke, Harvey J., and Robert C. Williamson. "Marital Adjustment: A Factor Analysis Study." *American Sociological Review.* 1958. 23, 562–569.

139. Nye, F. Ivan, and Evelyn MacDougall. "The Dependent Variable in Marital Research." *Pacific Sociological Review.* 1949. 2, 67–70.

140. Freedman, Ronald, Pascal Whelpton, and Arthur Campbell. "Family Planning in the U.S." *Scientific American.* April 1959. 200, 4, 50–55.

141. Orshansky, Mollie. "Children of the Poor." *Social Security Bulletin.* July 1963. 26, 7, 3–12.

142. Herzog, Elizabeth. "Unmarried Mothers: Some Questions To Be Answered and Some Answers To Be Questioned." *Child Welfare.* October 1962. XLI, 339–350.

143. "An Invitation To Help Protect Head Start." Washington, D.C.: Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity. 1965.

144. Bowlby, John. *Maternal Care and Mental Health.* World Health Organization Monograph No. 2. 1952.

145. Prugh, Dange G., Robert G. Harlow, R. G. Andry, Margaret Mead, Barbara Wootton, S. Lebovici, and Mary D. Ainsworth. *Deprivation of Maternal Care—a reassessment of its effects.* World Health Organization Public Health Paper No. 14. New York: International Documents Service, Columbia University Press.

146. Nimkoff, M. F. *Comparative Family Systems.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1965. pp. 357–369.

147. Young, Leontine. *Wednesday's Children.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1964.

148. Ackerman, Nathan. *The Psycho-Dynamics of Family Life.* New York: Basic Books. 1958.

149. Sussman, M. B. "The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or Fiction?" In *Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family.* M. B. Sussman, ed. Houghton Mifflin Co. 1963.

150. Chilman, Catherine, and Ivor Kraft. "Helping Low-Income Families Through Parent Education Groups." *Children.* July-August 1963.

151. Hill, Esther. "Helping Low-Income Families." *Children*. July-August 1963.

152. Shoemaker, Louise. *Parent and Family Life Education for Low-Income Groups: A Handbook For Workers*. Washington, D. C.: Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the sponsorship of the Interdepartmental Committee on Children and Youth. 1966.

153. From reports prepared by the Division of Adult Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. May 1965.

154. Mayer, Anna B., and Alfred J. Kahn. *Day Care As a Social Instrument*. New York: Columbia University School of Social Work. January 1965.

155. Arnold, Mildred. "Meeting Family Needs Through Homemaker Service." Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1957.

156. Morlock, Maud. "Homemaker Services: History and Bibliography." Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1964.

157. Weinandy, Janet. "Case Work With Tenants in a Public Housing Project." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1964. 26, 4.

158. Alpert, Richard. "Recent Studies of the Adolescent's Search For Significance." *Recent Research on Creative Approaches to Environmental Stress*. Iowa City, Iowa: State University of Iowa. 1963.

159. Riessman, Frank. "New Approaches to Mental Health Treatment For Labor and Low Income Groups." Mental Health Report No. 2. New York: National Institute for Labor Education, 250 West 57th Street. 1964.

160. Kluckholn, Richard. "Creative Approaches to Family Conflicts." *Recent Research on Creative Approaches to Environmental Stress*. Iowa City, Iowa: State University of Iowa. 1963.

161. Leslie, Gerald R. "The Field of Marriage Counseling." In *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*. Harold T. Christiansen, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company. 1964.

162. Levine, Rachel A. "Treatment in the Home: An Experiment With Mental Health of the Poor." Frank Riessman, Jerome Cohen, Arthur Peall, eds. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe. 1964. pp. 329–335.

163. Riessman, Frank. "The Revolution in Social Work: The New Non-Professional." New Brunswick, New Jersey: Training Department, Mobilization For Youth and Urban Study Center, Rutgers University. October 1962. (Mimeo)

164. Reiff, Robert, and Frank Riessman. "The Indigenous Non-Professional." National Institute of Labor Education. Report No. 3. 1964.

165. Levinson, Perry, and Jeffry Schiller. "The Indigenous Non-Professional: Research Issues." Research Working Paper #6. Washington, D.C.: Division of Research, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

166. Riessman, Frank. "The Helper' Therapy Principle." *Social Work*. April 1965. 10, 2.

167. Pines, Maya. "The Coming Upheaval in Psychiatry." *Harper's Magazine*. October 1965. pp. 54–60.

168. Kerckhoff, Richard K. *Family Life Education in America*. In *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*. Harold T. Christiansen, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company. 1964.

169. Lieberman, E. James. "Preventive Psychiatry and Family Planning." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. November 1964. 26, 4, 471–477.

170. Jaffe, Frederick S. "Family Planning and Poverty." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. November 1964. 26, 4 467–470.

171. Corkey, Elizabeth C. "A Family Planning Program For the Low-Income Family." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1964. 26, 4.

172. Rainwater, Lee. *Family Design*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co. 1965.

173. *The Extension of Legal Services to the Poor*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. 1964.

174. Duhl, Leonard, ed. *The Urban Condition*. New York: Basic Books. 1963.

175. Fantl, Berta. *Integrating Social and Psychological Theories in Social Work Practice*. Jerome Cohen, ed. Northampton, Massachusetts: Smith College Studies in Social Work. June 1964. XXXIV, 3.

176. Murphy, Lois and Associates. *Widening World of Childhood*. New York: Basic Books. 1962.

177. Escalona, S. and G. Heider. *Prediction and Outcome*. New York: Basic Books. 1959.

178. Langner, Thomas S. and Stanley T. Michael. *Life Stress and Mental Health*. London: Free Press of Glencoe, Collier-Macmillan, Ltd. 1963.

179. Brim, Orville. *Education for Child-Rearing*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1959.

180. Herzog, Elizabeth. *Some Guidelines For Evaluative Research*. Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Publication 375. 1959.

181. Miller, D. R., and G. E. Swanson. *The Changing American Parent*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1958.

☆ U.S. Government Printing Office: 1966—210-683